

Existence and uniqueness results for viscous, heat-conducting 3-D fluid with vacuum*

Ting Zhang[†] and Daoyuan Fang

Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, PR China

Abstract

We consider the 3-D full Navier-Stokes equations whose the viscosity coefficients and the thermal conductivity coefficient depend on the density and the temperature. We prove the local existence and uniqueness of the strong solution in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The initial density may vanish in an open set and Ω could be a bounded or unbounded domain. We also prove a blow-up criterion for the solution. Finally, we show the blow-up of the smooth solution to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 1$) when the initial density has compactly support and the initial total momentum is nonzero.

Keywords: Compressible Navier-Stokes equations; Existence; Uniqueness; Blow-up.

AMS Subject Classification: 35Q30; 76N10.

1 Introduction

The motion of a viscous, heat-conducting fluid in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ can be described by the system of equations, known as the Navier-Stokes equations:

$$\rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

$$(\rho u)_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u \otimes u) - \operatorname{div}(\mu(\nabla u + \nabla u^\top)) - \nabla(\lambda \operatorname{div} u) + \nabla p = \rho f \quad (1.2)$$

$$(\rho e)_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho e u) - \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \theta) + p \operatorname{div} u = \frac{\mu}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^\top|^2 + \lambda (\operatorname{div} u)^2 + \rho h, \quad (1.3)$$

in $(0, +\infty) \times \Omega \subset (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^3$, and the initial and boundary conditions:

$$(\rho, \theta, u)|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (1.4)$$

$$(\theta, u) = (\theta_b, 0) \text{ on } (0, \infty) \times \partial\Omega, \quad (1.5)$$

$$(\rho, \theta, u)(t, x) \rightarrow (\rho^\infty, \theta^\infty, 0) \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.6)$$

In this paper, Ω is either a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary or an usual unbounded domain such as the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$ ($\theta_b = \theta^\infty$) and an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. The known fields h and f denote a heat source and an external force per unit mass. ρ , θ , e , p and u denote the unknown density, temperature, internal energy, pressure and velocity fields of the fluid, respectively. The pressure p and internal energy e are related to the density and temperature via the equations of state:

$$p = p(\rho, \theta), \quad e = e(\rho, \theta).$$

*This work is supported by NSFC 10571158, and Zhejiang Association for international exchange of personal.

[†]Email: TZ: zhangting79@hotmail.com; DF: dyf@zju.edu.cn

In accordance with the basic principles of classical thermodynamics, p and e are interrelated through the following relationship:

$$\partial_\rho e = \frac{1}{\rho^2}(p - \theta \partial_\theta p).$$

In view of classical thermodynamics (see the book [15]), the viscosity coefficient $\mu = \mu(\rho, \theta)$, the second viscosity coefficient $\lambda = \lambda(\rho, \theta)$ and the thermal conductivity coefficient $\kappa = \kappa(\rho, \theta)$ are required to satisfy the natural restriction

$$\mu > 0, \quad 3\lambda + 2\mu \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa \geq 0.$$

In this paper, we assume that $(e, p, \kappa, \mu, \lambda)$ satisfy

$$\partial_\theta e(\rho, \theta) \geq \underline{c} > 0, \quad 0 \leq p(\rho, \theta) \leq \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} p_0(\rho)(1 + \theta^2), \quad (1.7)$$

$$|\partial_\theta p(\rho, \theta)| \leq \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} p_1(\rho)(1 + \theta), \quad |\partial_\rho p(\rho, \theta)| \leq p_2(\rho)(1 + \theta^2), \quad (1.8)$$

$$\mu(\rho, \theta) \geq \mu^0 > 0, \quad 3\lambda(\rho, \theta) + 2\mu(\rho, \theta) \geq 0, \quad \kappa(\rho, \theta) \geq \kappa^0 > 0, \quad (1.9)$$

$$\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} \partial_\theta(\partial_\theta e, \partial_\rho e, \mu, \lambda, \kappa)(\rho, \theta) \in L_{loc}^\infty([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)), \quad (1.10)$$

$$\partial_\theta e, \partial_\rho e, p, \mu, \lambda, \kappa \in C^1([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)), \quad p_0, p_1, p_2 \in C([0, \infty)), \quad (1.11)$$

and

$$\partial_\theta p, \partial_\rho p \in C^\alpha([0, \infty), L_{loc}^\infty([0, \infty))), \quad (1.12)$$

for all $\rho, \theta \geq 0$ and a constant $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. It is easy to see that the ideal flow ($p = R\rho\theta$, $e = C_v\theta$, and $C_v, \kappa, \mu, \lambda = \text{constants}$) satisfies the above assumptions with $p_0 = p_1 = \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $p_2 = 1$. The above assumptions are motivated by the facts in [2, 24] where it is pointed out that μ, λ and κ of a real gas are vary with the temperature and density, e grows as $\theta^{1+\gamma}$ with $\gamma \approx 0.5$ and κ increases like θ^q with $q \in [4.5, 5.5]$.

In the case that the data $(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0, f, h)$ are sufficiently regular and the initial density ρ_0 is bounded away from zero, there exists a unique local strong solution to the problem (1.1)-(1.6), and the solution exists globally in time provided that the initial data are small in some sense. For details, we refer the readers to papers [9, 14, 17, 20] and the references therein. When μ, λ, κ are three constants, there have been some existence results on the strong solutions for the general case of nonnegative initial density. R. Salvi and I. Straškraba showed in [18] that if Ω is a bounded domain, $p(\cdot) \in C^2[0, \infty)$, $\rho_0 \in H^2$, $u_0 \in H_0^1 \cap H^2$ and the compatibility condition:

$$-\mu \operatorname{div}(\nabla u_0 + \nabla u_0^\top) - \lambda \nabla \operatorname{div} u_0 + \nabla p(\rho_0) = \rho_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g, \quad \text{for } g \in L^2, \quad (1.13)$$

is satisfied, then there exists a unique local strong solution (ρ, u) to the initial boundary value problem for the isentropic fluids. Independently of their work, H. J. Choe and H. Kim [7] proved a similar existence result when Ω is either a bounded domain or the whole space, $p = a\rho^\gamma$ ($a > 0, \gamma > 1$), $\rho \in L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,6}$, $u_0 \in D_0^1 \cap D^2$ and the condition (1.13) is satisfied. Later, there are some results in [3, 5].

Considering the physically important case that coefficients μ, λ and κ are not constants, some results had obtained in one-dimension, see [13, 21, 23, 25] etc.; Feireisl[12] proved the existence of globally defined variational solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with temperature-dependent viscosity; and some results had obtained for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, see [6, 8, 15] etc.. In [6], Cho-Kim study the case that $(\mu, \lambda, \kappa) =$

$(\mu, \lambda, \kappa)(\rho, \rho\theta)$, and this method is fail to our case that $(\mu, \lambda, \kappa) = (\mu, \lambda, \kappa)(\rho, \theta)$, since the density will be degenerate. In this paper, we shall combine the ideas in [5, 6, 8, 12, 15] to study strong solutions to the initial boundary value problem (1.1)-(1.6) in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, with nonnegative initial density and $(e, p, \kappa, \mu, \lambda) = (e, p, \kappa, \mu, \lambda)(\rho, \theta)$. The lack of simplicity of real flow $(e, p, \kappa, \mu, \lambda) = (e, p, \kappa, \mu, \lambda)(\rho, \theta)$ makes the analysis significantly different from the ideal flow ($p = R\rho\theta$, $e = C_v\theta$, and $C_v, \kappa, \mu, \lambda = \text{constants}$).

Throughout this paper, we use the following simplified notations for the standard homogeneous and inhomogeneous Sobolev spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} L^r &= L^r(\Omega), \quad W^{k,r} = W^{k,r}(\Omega), \quad H^k = W^{k,2}, \\ D^{k,r} &= \{v \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega) : \|\nabla^k v\|_{L^r} < \infty\}, \quad D^k = D^{k,2}, \\ D_0^1 &= \{v \in L^6 : \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} < \infty \text{ and } v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}, \quad H_0^1 = D_0^1 \cap L^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the classical Sobolev embedding results that

$$\|w\|_{L^6} \leq C\|w\|_{D_0^1}, \quad \|w\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|w\|_{W^{1,q}}, \quad \|w\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|w\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^{1,q}}$$

and

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|w\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2}, \quad \|w\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|w\|_{L^6 \cap D^{1,q}},$$

provided that $q > 3$. Hereafter, we denote by C a generic positive constant depending only on the fixed constant q and the norms of (h, f) . When Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary, we choose $\theta_c \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfying $\theta_c \equiv \theta_b$ near $\partial\Omega$. When Ω is the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$ or an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary, we choose $\theta_c \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfying $\theta_c \equiv \theta_b$ near $\partial\Omega$ and $\theta_c|_{B_R^c} \equiv \theta^\infty$ where $B_R^c = \{|x| \geq R\}$ and R is large enough. When $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$, we choose $\theta_c \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfying $\theta_c|_{B_R^c} \equiv \theta^\infty$.

Our existence and uniqueness result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\rho^\infty, \theta_b, \theta^\infty \geq 0$ and $3 < q < 6$ be fixed constants. Assume that $(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0, h, f)$ satisfy the regularity conditions*

$$\rho_0 \geq 0, \quad \rho_0 - \rho^\infty \in L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}, \quad (\theta_0 - \theta_c, u_0) \in D_0^1 \cap D^2, \quad (1.14)$$

$$(h, f) \in C([0, \infty); L^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; L^q) \text{ and } (h_t, f_t) \in L^2(0, \infty; H^{-1}) \quad (1.15)$$

and the compatibility condition

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\kappa_0 \nabla \theta_0) - Q(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) = \rho_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g_1, \\ L(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) + \nabla p(\rho_0, \theta_0) = \rho_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g_2, \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (1.16)$$

for some $(g_1, g_2) \in L^2$, where $\kappa_0 = \kappa(\rho_0, \theta_0)$, $Q(\rho, \theta, u) = \frac{\mu(\rho, \theta)}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^\top|^2 + \lambda(\rho, \theta)(\operatorname{div} u)^2$ and $L(\rho, \theta, u) = -\operatorname{div}(\mu(\rho, \theta)(\nabla u + \nabla u^\top)) - \nabla(\lambda(\rho, \theta)\operatorname{div} u)$. Then there exist a small time $T_* > 0$ and a unique strong solution (ρ, θ, u) to the initial boundary value problem (1.1)-(1.6) such that

$$\rho - \rho^\infty \in C([0, T_*]; L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}), \quad \rho_t \in C([0, T_*]; L^2 \cap L^q), \quad (1.17)$$

$$(\theta - \theta_c, u) \in C([0, T_*]; D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0, T_*; D^{2,q}), \quad (1.18)$$

$$(\theta_t, u_t) \in L^2(0, T_*; D_0^1) \text{ and } (\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t, \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t) \in L^\infty([0, T_*]; L^2), \quad (1.19)$$

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta(t, \cdot) - \theta_0(\cdot), u(t, \cdot) - u_0(\cdot))\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.20)$$

Furthermore, we have the following blow-up criterion: If T^* is the maximal existence time of the strong solution (ρ, θ, u) and $T^* < \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{t \nearrow T^*} (\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \\ & + \int_0^t \|\nabla \theta_t(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \|\theta(t, \cdot) - \theta_c\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^{1,6}} + \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}) = \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (1.21)$$

Remark 1.1. The $L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}$ -regularity of $\rho_0 - \rho^\infty$ seems inevitable to prove the local well-posedness in the framework of Sobolev spaces for any compressible fluid model in three dimensions, because the Sobolev embedding $L^6 \cap D^{1,q} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$ holds only for $q > 3$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Moreover, we allow ρ_0 and ρ^∞ to vanish and so we may consider both interior vacuum and vacuum at infinity. Here, we only assume that $\rho_0 - \rho^\infty \in L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}$, which is weaker than the assumption in [6].

Remark 1.2. To simplify the presentation, we only give the proof of the case that $\theta_b = \theta^\infty = \theta_c = 0$.

Remark 1.3. As has been observed in [3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 18], the lack of a positive lower bound of ρ_0 should be compensated with the compatibility condition (1.16). If (ρ, θ, u) is a sufficiently smooth solution to (1.1)-(1.3), then letting $t \rightarrow 0$ in the equations (1.2)-(1.3), we easily derive a natural condition: there exists a pair (g_1, g_2) of scalar and vector fields such that

$$-\operatorname{div}(\kappa_0 \nabla \theta_0) - Q(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) = \rho_0 g_1 \text{ and } L(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) + \nabla p(\rho_0, \theta_0) = \rho_0 g_2 \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (1.22)$$

But it turns out that the weaker condition (1.16) is sufficient to prove the local existence and uniqueness of strong solution. Roughly speaking, the compatibility condition (1.16) is equivalent to the L^2 -integrability of $\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t$ and $\sqrt{\rho}u_t$ at $t = 0$. Consider the elliptic system with variable coefficients, we obtain some regularity results in Section 5. Under these elliptic regularity results and the condition (1.16), we could deduce that $(\theta_t, u_t) \in L^2(0, T; D_0^1)$ and $(\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t, \sqrt{\rho}u_t) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2)$ for a small time $T > 0$. Here, the compatibility condition (1.16) is satisfied automatically for all initial data (ρ_0, θ_0, u_0) with the regularity (1.14) whenever ρ_0 is bounded away from zero.

Remark 1.4. Consider the isentropic case and μ, λ being constants, B. Desjardins [10] prove the local existence of a weak solution (ρ, u) with a bounded nonnegative density to the periodic problem as long as

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T^*} (\|\rho(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} + \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}) < \infty;$$

Y. Cho, H. J. Choe and H. Kim [3] proved the local existence of a weak solution (ρ, u) as long as

$$\limsup_{t \nearrow T^*} (\|\rho(t)\|_{H^1 \cap W^{1,q}} + \|u(t)\|_{D_0^1}) < \infty.$$

Using similar arguments in our proof, we can see that in the special case that the function $e_\theta = e_\theta(\rho)$ is independent of the function θ , (1.21) may be replaced by

$$\limsup_{t \nearrow T^*} (\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta - \theta_c, u)(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^{1,6}}) = \infty. \quad (1.23)$$

Furthermore, since the local existence time T_* and all regularity estimates of the strong solution in Theorem 1.1 depend only on $\|(g_1, g_2)\|_{L^2}$ and the norms of the initial data $(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0, f, h)$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 also shows that the continuous dependence of the solution on the initial data holds at least for a small time interval. We may state the following result without a proof.

Theorem 1.2. For each $i = 1, 2$, let (ρ_i, θ_i, u_i) be the local strong solution to the initial boundary value problem (1.1)-(1.6) with the initial data $(\rho_{0i}, \theta_{0i}, u_{0i})$, which satisfy regularity conditions (1.14)-(1.15) and the compatibility condition (1.16) with $(g_1, g_2) = (g_{1i}, g_{2i})$. Assume also that for each $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\rho_{0i} - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta_{0i} - \theta_c, u_{0i})\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} + \|(g_{1i}, g_{2i})\|_{L^2} \\ & + \|(h, f)\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2 \cap L_t^2 L_x^q} + \|(h_t, f_t)\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{-1}} \leq K \end{aligned}$$

and $\bar{\rho}_0 = \rho_{01} - \rho_{02} \in X$, $(\sqrt{\rho_{01}}(\theta_{01} - \theta_{02}), \sqrt{\rho_{01}}(u_{01} - u_{02})) \in L^2$, where $X = L^2 \cap L^{\frac{3}{2}}$, if $\rho^\infty = 0$, $X = L^2$, if $\rho^\infty \neq 0$. Then there exist a small time T_{**} and a positive constant C_K , such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T_{**}]} (\|\bar{\rho}\|_X^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho_1} \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho_1} \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2) + \int_0^{T_{**}} (\|\bar{\theta}\|_{D_0^1} + \|\bar{u}\|_{D_0^1}) dt \\ & \leq C_K (\|\bar{\rho}_0\|_X^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho_{01}} \bar{\theta}_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho_{01}} \bar{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\rho} = \rho_1 - \rho_2$, $\bar{\theta} = \theta_1 - \theta_2$ and $\bar{u} = u_1 - u_2$.

The global result of the initial boundary value problem (1.1)-(1.6) with $\rho_0 \geq 0$ is very difficult to obtained. For a special case that the temperature vanish in the vacuum state, we can give a blow-up result in Section 6.

In Section 6, we consider the following equations for a compressible fluid in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ (n \geq 1)$:

$$\rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \quad (1.24)$$

$$(\rho u)_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla p = \operatorname{div}(\mu(\nabla u + \nabla u^\top)) + \nabla(\lambda \operatorname{div} u), \quad (1.25)$$

$$(\rho e)_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho e u) + p \operatorname{div} u = \frac{\mu}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^\top|^2 + \lambda (\operatorname{div} u)^2 + \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla e), \quad (1.26)$$

where $(\kappa, \mu, \lambda) = (\kappa, \mu, \lambda)(\rho, \theta)$. In Section 6, we will consider only polytropic gas, so that the equations of the state of the gas is given by

$$p = R\rho\theta, \quad e = c_v\theta, \quad \text{and} \quad p = A \exp(S/c_v) \rho^\gamma, \quad (1.27)$$

where $R > 0$ is the gas constant, A is a positive constant of absolute value, $\gamma > 1$ is the ratio of specific heat, $c_v = \frac{R}{\gamma-1}$ is the specific heat at constant volume and S is the entropy. In Section 6, we only assume that

$$\mu(0, 0) > 0, \quad n\lambda(0, 0) + 2\mu(0, 0) = \lambda_0 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa(s_1, s_2) \geq 0, \quad (1.28)$$

for all $s_1, s_2 \geq 0$. The Navier-Stokes system is supplemented with the initial data

$$(\rho, S, u)|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, S_0, u_0)(x) \in H^k(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad k > \left[\frac{n}{2}\right] + 2.$$

The blow-up of smooth solutions of compressible Euler equations ($\mu = \lambda = \kappa = 0$) has been studied by several mathematicians. T.C. Sideris [19] showed that the life span T of the C^1 solution to the compressible Euler equations is finite when the initial data have compact support and the initial velocity is sufficiently large (super-sonic) in some region. When the initial density and velocity have compact supports, T. Makino, S. Ukai and S. Kawashima [16] shown the blow-up of smooth solutions to the compressible Euler equations in $\mathbb{R}^3$ without external force and heat source. In a different way from [16] and [19], Z. Xin [22] showed the same blow-up result for the compressible Euler equations. Considered the case that μ, λ are constants and $\kappa = 0$, Xin[22]

also showed similar results for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations for polytropic gas, when the initial density has compact support. In [4], authors extended Z. Xin's result[22] to the case of $\kappa > 0$ and μ, λ being constants. But their point of view in [4, 22] cannot be applied for the problem in Section 6, since the fact that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\operatorname{div}(\mu(\nabla u + \nabla u^\top)) + \nabla(\lambda \operatorname{div} u)] \cdot x dx = 0$$

is strongly necessary in their argument, which seems hard to be obtained here. Here, we extend the Xin's blow-up result to the case that μ, λ, κ depend on the density and the temperature.

Before stating our blow-up result, we introduce some notations. We denote by $B_r = B_r(0)$ the ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the radius r centered at the origin. We will use several physical quantities:

$$m_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0 dx \text{ (initial total mass),}$$

$$m_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0(x) x dx,$$

$$m_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0(x) u_0(x) dx \text{ (initial total momentum).}$$

We always assume that $m_0 > 0$.

For the proof of the blow-up, we have only to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *We assume that (μ, λ, κ) satisfies (1.28) and $T > 0$. Suppose that $(\rho, S, u) \in C^1([0, T]; H^k(\mathbb{R}^n))$, $k > [\frac{n}{2}] + 2$, is a solution to the Cauchy problem (1.24)-(1.27) with the initial data (ρ_0, S_0, u_0) , where the initial density ρ_0 is compactly supported in a ball B_{r_0} . Then we have*

$$m_0 r_0 \geq m_{1i} + m_{2i} T \geq -m_0 r_0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Remark 1.5. If T^* is the maximal existence time of the solution (ρ, S, u) . Then since m_0 is strictly positive, this theorem implies that T^* should be finite when $m_2 \neq 0$. This theorem also shows the relationship between the size of support and the life span. For example, the range of life span can be extended as the support of the initial density become larger. Especially, we can expect the global existence of the smooth solution to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations in the case that the initial density is positive but has decay at infinity.

Remark 1.6. As in [4, 22], our method need that the temperature vanish in the vacuum state, so we consider the entropy S and equation (1.27) which guarantee the temperature vanish in the vacuum state.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. First, based on some regularity results on elliptic system in Section 5, we obtain some *a priori* estimates for the linearized problem in Section 2. In Section 3, we will prove the existence results for the linearized problem. Then, using the usual iteration argument, we will prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 4. In Section 6, we will prove a blow-up result.

2 *A priori* estimates for the linearized problem

In this section, we consider the following linearized problem

$$\rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho v) = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\rho u_t + \rho v \cdot \nabla u + L(\sigma, \eta, u) + \nabla p(\rho, \theta) = \rho f, \text{ in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & e_\theta(\sigma, \eta) (\rho \theta_t + \rho v \cdot \nabla \theta) - \operatorname{div}(\kappa(\sigma, \eta) \nabla \theta) + p(\rho, \theta) \operatorname{div} v \\ &= Q(\sigma, \eta, v) + \rho h + e_\rho(\sigma, \eta) \rho^2 \operatorname{div} v, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

$$(\rho, \theta, u)|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) \text{ in } \Omega, \quad (2.4)$$

$$(\theta, u) = (0, 0) \text{ on } (0, T) \times \partial\Omega, \quad (2.5)$$

$$(\rho, e, u)(t, x) \rightarrow (\rho^\infty, 0, 0) \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.6)$$

where σ, η, v are three known functions on $(0, T) \times \Omega$. Recall that $Q(\sigma, \eta, v) = \frac{\mu(\sigma, \eta)}{2} |\nabla v + \nabla v^\top|^2 + \lambda(\sigma, \eta) (\operatorname{div} v)^2$ and $L(\sigma, \eta, u) = -\operatorname{div}(\mu(\sigma, \eta) (\nabla u + \nabla u^\top)) - \nabla(\lambda(\sigma, \eta) \operatorname{div} u)$.

Throughout this section, we assume that the known data satisfy the following regularities

$$\rho_0 \geq 0, \quad \rho_0 - \rho^\infty \in L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}, \quad (\theta_0, u_0) \in D_0^1 \cap D^2, \quad (2.7)$$

$$(h, f) \in C([0, \infty); L^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; L^q), \quad (h_t, f_t) \in L^2(0, \infty; H^{-1}), \quad (2.8)$$

$$(\eta, v) \in C([0, T]; D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0, T; D^{2,q}), \quad (\eta_t, v_t) \in L^2(0, T; D_0^1), \quad (2.9)$$

$$\sigma - \sigma^\infty \in C([0, T]; L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}), \quad \sigma_t \in C([0, T]; L^2 \cap L^q), \quad \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta_t \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^2), \quad (2.10)$$

for three constants $\rho^\infty, \sigma^\infty \geq 0$ and $q \in (3, 6)$. Then the existence of a unique strong solution (ρ, θ, u) to the linearized problem (2.1)-(2.6) can be proved by standard methods at least for the case that ρ_0 is bounded away from zero, i.e., $\rho_0 \geq \delta$. Using similar arguments in [3, 6, 8], applying the classical method of characteristics, a semi-discrete Galerkin method and the usual domain expansion technique, we can obtain the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that ρ_0 and v satisfy the regularities*

$$\rho_0 \geq 0, \quad \rho_0 - \rho^\infty \in C_0 \text{ and } v \in L^\infty([0, T]; D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0, T; D^{2,q})$$

for two constants $\rho^\infty \geq 0$ and $q \in (3, 6)$, where the space C_0 consists of continuous functions on Ω vanishing at infinity. Then there exists a unique weak solution ρ in $\rho^\infty + C([0, T]; C_0)$ to the linear hyperbolic problem (2.1), (2.4) and (2.6). Moreover the solution ρ can be represented by

$$\rho(t, x) = \rho_0(U(0, t, x)) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \operatorname{div} v(s, U(s, t, x)) ds \right\}, \quad (2.11)$$

where $U \in C([0, T] \times [0, T] \times \overline{\Omega})$ is the solution to the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} U(t, s, x) &= v(t, U(t, s, x)), & t \in [0, T] \\ U(s, s, x) &= x, & s \in [0, T], x \in \overline{\Omega}. \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

Assume in addition that $\rho_0 - \rho^\infty \in L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}$. Then, we also have

$$\rho - \rho^\infty \in C([0, T]; L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}) \text{ and } \rho_t \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^2 \cap L^q), \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} &\leq \left(\|\rho_0 - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + C \rho^\infty \int_0^t \|v(s, \cdot)\|_{D^2 \cap D^{2,q}} ds \right) \\ &\quad \times \exp \left(C \int_0^t \|\nabla v(s, \cdot)\|_{W^{1,q} \cap D^1} ds \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Lemma 2.2. Assume in addition to (2.7)-(2.10) that $\rho_0 \geq \delta$ in Ω for a constant $\delta > 0$. Then there exists a unique strong solution (ρ, θ, u) to the initial boundary value problem (2.1)-(2.6) in $[0, T]$ such that

$$\rho - \rho^\infty \in C([0, T]; L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}), \quad \rho_t \in C([0, T]; L^2 \cap L^q), \quad (2.15)$$

$$(\theta, u) \in C([0, T]; D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0, T; D^{2,q}), \quad (2.16)$$

$$(\theta_t, u_t) \in L^2(0, T; D_0^1) \cap C([0, T]; L^2), \quad (2.17)$$

$$\rho \geq \underline{\delta} \text{ on } [0, T] \times \overline{\Omega} \text{ for a constnat } \underline{\delta} > 0, \quad (2.18)$$

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta(t, \cdot) - \theta_0(\cdot), u(t, \cdot) - u_0(\cdot))\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.19)$$

Assume that the initial data (ρ_0, θ_0, u_0) satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 2.2 and the compatibility condition

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\kappa(\sigma(0), \eta(0)) \nabla \theta_0) - Q(\sigma(0), \eta(0), v(0)) = \rho_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g_1, \\ L(\sigma(0), \eta(0), u_0) + \nabla p(\rho_0, \theta_0) = \rho_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g_2 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

Let us choose a fixed c_0 so that

$$c_0 \geq 1 + \rho^\infty + \|\rho_0 - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta_0, u_0)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} + \|(g_1, g_2)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and

$$c_0 \geq \sigma^\infty + \|\sigma(0, \cdot) - \sigma^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\eta(0, \cdot), v(0, \cdot))\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2},$$

where $3 < q < 6$ and $\sigma^\infty, \rho^\infty \geq 0$ are three constants. Moreover, assume that σ, η, v satisfy the regularity stated in Lemma 2.2 and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1} + \int_0^T \left(\|v_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 \right) dt \leq c_1, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2} \leq c_2, \quad (2.22)$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (\|(\sqrt{\sigma} \eta_t)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + \|\eta(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2}) + \int_0^T \|\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 dt \leq c_3, \quad (2.23)$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (\|\sigma_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + \|\sigma(t, \cdot) - \sigma^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}}^2) \leq c_4, \quad (2.24)$$

for some fixed constants c_1, c_2, c_3 and c_4 such that

$$1 < c_0 < c_1 < c_2, \quad 1 < c_0 < c_3, c_4.$$

Then we could derive some *a priori* estimates for the solution (ρ, θ, u) which are independent of δ .

I. Estimates for the density and the coefficients $(\mu, \lambda, \kappa, e_\theta, e_\rho)$.

To estimate the density ρ , we first recall from (2.14) that

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} \leq C c_0 \exp \left(C \int_0^t \|\nabla v(s, \cdot)\|_{H^1 \cap W^{1,q}} ds \right)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. Then, using Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\int_0^t \|\nabla v\|_{H^1 \cap W^{1,q}} ds \leq t^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_0^t \|\nabla v\|_{H^1 \cap W^{1,q}}^2 ds \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(c_2 t + (c_2 t)^{\frac{1}{2}}),$$

and conclude that

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} \leq C c_0, \quad (2.25)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_0)$, where $T_0 = c_2^{-1} < 1$. Moreover, it follows from (2.11) and (2.25) that

$$C^{-1} \delta \leq \rho(t, x) \leq C c_0 \text{ for } 0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_0), x \in \overline{\Omega}. \quad (2.26)$$

From (2.21)-(2.23), using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\|\eta(t) - \eta(0)\|_{D_0^1} \leq C \int_0^t \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1} ds \leq C \left(\int_0^t \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C c_3^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.27)$$

$$\|\eta(t) - \eta(0)\|_{D^{1,q}} \leq C \|\eta(t) - \eta(0)\|_{D_0^1}^{\frac{6-q}{2q}} \|\eta(t) - \eta(0)\|_{D^2}^{\frac{3q-6}{2q}} \leq C c_3^{\frac{5q-6}{4q}} t^{\frac{6-q}{4q}}, \quad (2.28)$$

$$\|v(t) - v(0)\|_{D_0^1} \leq C \int_0^t \|v_t\|_{D_0^1} ds \leq C c_1^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.29)$$

$$\|v(t) - v(0)\|_{D^{1,q'}} \leq C \|v(t) - v(0)\|_{D_0^1}^{\frac{6-q'}{2q'}} \|v(t) - v(0)\|_{D^2}^{\frac{3q'-6}{2q'}} \leq C c_1^{\frac{6-q'}{4q'}} c_2^{\frac{3q'-6}{2q'}} t^{\frac{6-q'}{4q'}}, \quad (2.30)$$

for $q' = \max(q, 4)$. Let $T_1 = \min(T_0, c_0^2 c_3^{-1}, c_0^{\frac{4q}{6-q}} c_3^{-\frac{5q-6}{6-q}}, c_0^2 c_1^{-1}, c_0^{\frac{4q'}{6-q'}} c_1^{-1} c_2^{-\frac{6q'-12}{6-q'}})$, we have

$$\|\eta(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^{1,q'}} \leq C c_0, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1). \quad (2.31)$$

Using Sobolev's embedding theorem, we have

$$\|(\eta, v)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C c_0, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1).$$

From (2.1), (2.25) and (2.31), we obtain

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}}^2 + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \leq A_0 c_0^2, \quad (2.32)$$

where $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1)$. Here, the constant $A_0 > 1$ is independent of any one of c_i , $i = 0, \dots, 4$. Using the interpolation inequality, we have

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^6} \leq C \|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq C c_0^2 t^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

where $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1)$.

Choosing $c_4 = A_0 c_0^2$, from (1.10)-(1.11), (2.23)-(2.24) and (2.31), we have, for any $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \mu(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \\ & \leq \|\mu_\rho(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot)) \nabla \sigma(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + \|\mu_\theta(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot)) \nabla \eta(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \\ & \leq C(c_0) (\|\nabla \sigma(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + \|\nabla \eta(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q}) \leq C(c_0), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\mu_t(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot))\|_{L^3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|\mu_\rho(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot))\sigma_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^3} + \|\mu_\theta(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot))\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^3} \\
&\leq C(c_0) \left(\|\sigma_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^3} + \|\sigma^{\frac{1}{4}}\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^3} \right) \\
&\leq C(c_0)\|\sigma_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^3} + C(c_0)\|\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^6}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C(c_0)(c_3 + c_3^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^{\frac{1}{2}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1)} (\|(\mu, \lambda, \kappa, e_\theta, e_\rho)(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot))\|_{C^\beta} + \|(p_0, p_1, p_2)(\rho(t, \cdot))\|_{L^\infty}) \leq c_5, \quad (2.33)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1)} \|\nabla(\mu, \lambda, \kappa, e_\theta, e_\rho)(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \leq c_5, \quad (2.34)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1)} \|\partial_t(\mu, \lambda, \kappa, e_\theta, e_\rho)(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot))\|_{L^3} \leq c_5 \left(c_3 + c_3^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \quad (2.35)$$

for a constant $c_5 > 1$ which depend only on c_0 , and $\beta = 1 - \frac{3}{q} \in (0, 1)$.

II. Estimates for the internal energy and the pressure.

Taking the operator ∂_t to the equation (2.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&e_\theta \rho \theta_{tt} - \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \theta_t) - \operatorname{div}(\kappa_t \nabla \theta) + (p \operatorname{div} v)_t \\
&= Q(\sigma, \eta, v)_t + (\rho h)_t - (e_\theta \rho v \cdot \nabla \theta)_t - (e_\theta \rho)_t \theta_t + (e_\rho \rho^2 \operatorname{div} v)_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Then multiplying this by θ_t , integrating over Ω and using (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int e_\theta \rho \theta_t^2 dx + \int \kappa |\nabla \theta_t|^2 dx + \int (p \operatorname{div} v)_t \theta_t dx - \int \theta_t \operatorname{div}(\kappa_t \nabla \theta) dx \\
&= \int \left(-\frac{1}{2} (e_\theta \rho)_t \theta_t^2 + \theta_t (- (e_\theta \rho v \cdot \nabla \theta)_t + Q(\sigma, \eta, v)_t + (\rho h)_t + (e_\rho \rho^2 \operatorname{div} v)_t) \right) dx
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int e_\theta \rho \theta_t^2 dx + \kappa^0 \int |\nabla \theta_t|^2 dx \\
&\leq C \int (|p_t| |\nabla v| |\theta_t| + p |\nabla v_t| |\theta_t| + |\kappa_t| |\nabla \theta| |\nabla \theta_t| + \rho |\partial_t e_\theta| |\theta_t|^2 \\
&\quad + |\rho v \cdot \nabla (e_\theta \theta_t^2)| + |(e_\theta \rho v \cdot \nabla \theta)_t| |\theta_t| + (\mu + |\lambda|) |\nabla v| |\nabla v_t| |\theta_t| + (|\mu_t| + |\lambda_t|) |\nabla v|^2 |\theta_t| \\
&\quad + |\rho_t| |h| |\theta_t| + |h_t| \rho |\theta_t| + |\theta_t| |(e_\rho \rho^2 \operatorname{div} v)_t|) dx := \sum_{j=1}^{11} I_j. \quad (2.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Using (2.21), (2.25)-(2.26) and (2.32)-(2.35), applying the Cauchy-Schwartz, Gagliardo-Nirenberg, Hölder and Sobolev's inequalities, we can estimate each term $I_j(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_1)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq C \int (|p_\theta \theta_t| + |p_\rho \rho_t|) |\nabla v| |\theta_t| dx \\
&\leq C \int p_1 (1 + \theta) \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} |\theta_t|^2 |\nabla v| dx + C \int p_2 (1 + \theta^2) |\rho_t| |\nabla v| |\theta_t| dx \\
&\leq C c_5 (\|\theta\|_{L^6} \|\nabla v\|_{L^6} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^3}) \|\sqrt{\rho} \theta_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +Cc_5 \left(\|\theta\|_{L^6}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^6} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \right) \|\rho_t\|_{L^3} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1} \\
\leq & Cc_2^6 c_5^2 \left(1 + \|\theta\|_{D_0^1}^4 \right) (1 + \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{\kappa^0}{20} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 & \leq C \int p_0(1 + \theta^2) \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} |\nabla v_t| |\theta_t| dx \\
& \leq Cc_5 \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2} \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2} (1 + \|\theta\|_{L^\infty}^2) \\
& \leq \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + Cc_5^2 \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 (1 + \|\theta\|_{D_0^1}^4 + \|\theta\|_{D^2}^4),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 & \leq C \|\kappa_t\|_{L^3} \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^6} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2} \leq Cc_5^2 (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}) \|\theta\|_{D^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0}{20} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq Cc_5^2 c_3^2 \|\theta\|_{D^2}^2 + c_3^{-1} \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 + Cc_5^4 c_3^3 \|\theta\|_{D^2}^4 + \frac{\kappa^0}{20} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 & \leq C \|\partial_t e_\theta\|_{L^3} \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1} \\
& \leq Cc_0 c_5^2 (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}) \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0}{40} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_5 & \leq C \int \rho |v| |\nabla e_\theta| |\theta_t|^2 + \rho |v| |e_\theta| |\theta_t| |\nabla\theta_t| dx \\
& \leq C \left(\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla e_\theta\|_{L^3} + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^\infty} \|e_\theta\|_{L^\infty} \right) \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1} \\
& \leq Cc_5^2 c_0^3 \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0}{40} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_6 & \leq C (\|\partial_t e_\theta\|_{L^3} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{L^\infty} + \|e_\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_t\|_{L^3} \|v\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1} \\
& \quad + C \|e_\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2} \|v_t\|_{D_0^1} \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^3} + \|e_\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^\infty} \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq Cc_5^2 (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}) c_0^4 \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2}^2 + Cc_0^3 c_5^2 \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0}{40} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \quad + \|v_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 + Cc_0 c_5^2 \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2} \|\theta\|_{D^2} \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$I_7 \leq Cc_5 \|\nabla v\|_{L^3} \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^6} \leq Cc_0^2 c_5^2 \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0}{20} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_8 & \leq C (\|\mu_t\|_{L^3} + \|\lambda_t\|_{L^3}) \|(\nabla v)^2\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^6} \\
& \leq Cc_5 (c_3 + c_3^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}^{\frac{1}{2}}) c_0^2 \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq Cc_5^2 c_0^4 (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}) + \frac{\kappa^0}{20} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$I_9 \leq C \|\rho_t\|_{L^3} \|h\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{L^6} \leq Cc_0^2 \|h\|_{L^2} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2} \leq Cc_0^4 \|h\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0}{20} \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$I_{10} \leq C \|h_t\|_{H^{-1}} \|\rho\theta_t\|_{H^1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \|h_t\|_{H^{-1}} (\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^3} \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C c_0^2 \|h_t\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0}{20} \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{11} &\leq \|\partial_t e_\rho\|_{L^3} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1} + \|e_\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_t\|_{L^3} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1} \\
&\quad + \|e_\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2} \|\sqrt{\rho} \theta_t\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C c_5^2 (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}) c_0^6 + \frac{\kappa^0}{40} \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C c_0^3 c_5^2 \|\sqrt{\rho} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these estimates into (2.36), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{e_\theta \rho} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa^0 \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C c_2^6 c_5^2 (1 + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2}^4 + \|\theta\|_{D_2}^4) (1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2) + C c_5^2 c_3^2 \|\theta\|_{D_2}^2 + C c_3^{-1} \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 \\
&\quad + C c_3^3 c_5^4 \|\theta\|_{D_2}^4 + C c_0^2 c_5^2 \|v_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 + C c_0^4 c_5^2 (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}) (\|\sqrt{\rho} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2}^2) \\
&\quad + C c_0^6 c_5^2 (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}) + C c_0^4 \|h\|_{L^2}^2 + C c_0^2 \|h_t\|_{H^{-1}}^2 \\
&\leq C c_2^8 c_3^3 c_5^4 (1 + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2}^4 + \|\theta\|_{D_2}^4) (1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^4) + C c_3^{-1} \|\eta_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 + C c_0^2 c_5^2 \|v_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 \\
&\quad + C c_0^{12} c_3^3 c_5^4 + C c_0^4 \|h\|_{L^2}^2 + C c_0^2 \|h_t\|_{H^{-1}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and then integrating this over (τ, t) , using the estimates (2.8), (2.21) and (2.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\sqrt{e_\theta \rho} \theta_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_\tau^t \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\
&\leq C \|(\sqrt{e_\theta \rho} \theta_t)(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + C c_0^2 c_1 c_5^2 + C c_0^{12} c_3^3 c_5^4 t \\
&\quad + C c_2^8 c_3^3 c_5^4 \int_\tau^t (1 + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2}^4 + \|\theta\|_{D_2}^4) (1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^4) ds, \tag{2.37}
\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \tau < t \leq \min(T, T_1)$. To estimate $\limsup_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \|\sqrt{e_\theta \rho} \theta_t(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2$, we observe from the equation (2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int e_\theta \rho \theta_t^2 dx &\leq C \int (\rho |h|^2 + e_\theta \rho |v|^2 |\nabla \theta|^2 + \rho^{-1} p^2 |\nabla v|^2 \\
&\quad + \rho^{-1} (\operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \theta) + Q(\sigma, \eta, v))^2 + e_\theta^2 \rho^3 |\nabla v|^2) dx
\end{aligned}$$

and using the estimates (2.20) and (2.33), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \|\sqrt{e_\theta \rho} \theta_t(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C (\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \|h(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|e_\theta(\sigma(0), \eta(0))\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u_0\|_{H^1}^2 \|\nabla \theta_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|g_1\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + \|p_0^2(\rho_0)(1 + \theta_0^2)\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla v(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|e_\rho(\sigma(0), \eta(0))\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}^3 \|\nabla v(0)\|_{L^2}^2) \leq C c_0^5 c_5^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, letting $\tau \rightarrow 0$ in (2.37), we deduce that

$$\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds$$

$$\leq C c_2^8 c_3^3 c_5^4 \int_0^t (1 + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2}^4 + \|\theta\|_{D^2}^4) (1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^4) ds + C c_0^4 c_1 c_5^2, \quad (2.38)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_2)$, where $T_2 = \min(T_1, c_0^{-8} c_3^{-3} c_5^{-2})$. On the other hand, since

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2}^2 = 2 \int \nabla \theta \cdot \nabla \theta_t dx \leq 2 \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2},$$

it follows that

$$\|\nabla \theta(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\nabla \theta_0\|_{L^2}^2 + C \int_0^t \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds,$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_2)$. Combining this and (2.38), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla \theta(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ & \leq C c_2^8 c_3^3 c_5^4 \int_0^t (1 + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2}^4 + \|\theta\|_{D^2}^4) (1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^4) ds + C c_0^4 c_1 c_5^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_2)$.

To estimate $\|\theta\|_{D^2}$, we use the following elliptic regularity results: if $(f, g) \in D_0^1 \cap D^{1,q}$ is a solution to the elliptic system

$$-\operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla f) = F \text{ and } -\operatorname{div}(\mu(\nabla g + \nabla g^\top)) - \nabla(\lambda \operatorname{div} g) = G, \text{ in } \Omega$$

with $(F, G) \in L^2 \cap L^q$. From (2.33)-(2.34), we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_2)} \|(\kappa, \mu, \lambda)(\sigma(t, \cdot), \eta(t, \cdot))\|_{C^\beta \cap D^{1,q}} \leq c_5, \quad \beta = 1 - \frac{3}{q}.$$

From Lemma 5.5 and 5.7, we have $(f, g) \in D^2$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{D^2(\Omega)} \leq c_6 \left(\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{\frac{q}{q-3}} \|f\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right), \quad (2.40)$$

$$\|g\|_{D^2(\Omega)} \leq c_6 \left(\|G\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{\frac{q}{q-3}} \|g\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right), \quad (2.41)$$

and from Lemma 5.6 and 5.8, we have $(f, g) \in D^{2,q}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq c_6 \left(\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{\frac{5q-6}{2q-6}} \|f\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right), \quad (2.42)$$

$$\|g\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq c_6 \left(\|G\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla g\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{\frac{5q-6}{2q-6}} \|g\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right), \quad (2.43)$$

where the constant $c_6 = c_6(c_0) > 1$ depends only on c_0 . It should be noted that the estimates (2.40)-(2.43) hold for both bounded and unbounded domains. Applying the elliptic regularity result (2.40) to the equation $-\operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla e) = F$ in Ω , where $F = \rho(h - e_\theta \theta_t - e_\theta v \cdot \nabla \theta) - p \operatorname{div} v + Q(\sigma, \eta, v) + e_\rho \rho^2 \operatorname{div} v$, using Hölder and Sobolev's inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta\|_{D^2} & \leq C c_6 (\|\rho h\|_{L^2} + \|e_\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho \theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|e_\theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho v \cdot \nabla \theta\|_{L^2} + \|p \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + \|Q(\sigma, \eta, v)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{\frac{q}{q-3}} \|\theta\|_{D^1(\Omega)} + \|e_\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq Cc_0^3c_5c_6(1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2}) + Cc_6c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}}\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + Cc_6\|p_0\sqrt{\rho}\|_{L^\infty}\|(1 + \theta^2)\nabla v\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq Cc_2^3c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}}c_6(1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2}^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

Combining this and (2.39), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla\theta(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\
&\leq Cc_2^{20}c_3^3c_5^{\frac{6q}{q-3}}c_6^4 \int_0^t [(1 + \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2}^8 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^4)(1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^4) ds + Cc_0^4c_1c_5^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.45}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_2)$. Now we define a function $H(t)$ by

$$H(t) = 1 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Then it follows from (2.45) that

$$H(t) \leq Cc_0^4c_1c_5^2 + Cc_2^{20}c_3^3c_5^{\frac{6q}{q-3}}c_6^4 \int_0^t H^6(s) ds \text{ for } 0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_2).$$

Solving this integral inequality, we easily derive

$$H(t) \leq Cc_0^4c_1c_5^2(1 - Cc_2^{45}c_3^3c_5^{\frac{11q}{q-3}}c_6^4t)^{-\frac{1}{5}} \text{ for all small } t \geq 0.$$

Therefore, taking $T_3 = \min(T_2, (2Cc_2^{45}c_3^3c_5^{\frac{11q}{q-3}}c_6^4)^{-1})$, we conclude that

$$\|\theta(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\theta_t(s)\|_{D_0^1}^2 ds \leq A_1c_0^4c_1c_5^2, \tag{2.46}$$

and

$$\|\theta(t)\|_{D^2} \leq A_1c_2^8c_5^{\frac{2q}{q-3}}c_6, \tag{2.47}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_3)$. Here, the constant $A_1 > 1$ is independent of any one of c_i , $i = 0, \dots, 6$. From (2.46)-(2.47), using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\|\theta(t) - \theta_0\|_{D_0^1} \leq C \int_0^t \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1} ds \leq C \left(\int_0^t \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Cc_0^2c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}c_5t^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Cc_0, \tag{2.48}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\theta(t) - \theta_0\|_{D^{1,q}} &\leq C\|\theta(t) - \theta_0\|_{D_0^1}^{\frac{6-q}{2q}} \|\theta(t) - \theta_0\|_{D^2}^{\frac{3q-6}{2q}} \\
&\leq Cc_2^8c_5^{\frac{2q}{q-3}}c_6t^{\frac{6-q}{4q}} \leq Cc_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$, where $T_4 = \min(T_3, c_2^{-\frac{32q}{6-q}}c_5^{-\frac{8q^2}{(q-3)(6-q)}}c_6^{-\frac{4q}{6-q}})$. Therefor, from (1.7)-(1.8), (2.46) and (2.48)-(2.49), using Hölder and Sobolev's inequalities, we obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)} \left(\|\theta(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|\theta(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \right) \leq Cc_0, \tag{2.50}$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)} \|p(\rho(t, \cdot), \theta(t, \cdot))\|_{L^\infty} \leq Cc_0^3c_5, \tag{2.51}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)} \|\nabla p(\rho(t, \cdot), \theta(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \\
& \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)} (\|p_\rho \nabla \rho\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + \|p_\theta \nabla \theta\|_{L^2 \cap L^q}) \\
& \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)} (\|p_2(1 + \theta^2) \nabla \rho\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + \|p_1 \sqrt{\rho}(1 + \theta) \nabla \theta\|_{L^2 \cap L^q}) \\
& \leq C c_0^3 c_5,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)} \|\partial_t p(\rho(t, \cdot), \theta(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2} \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)} (\|p_\rho \rho_t\|_{L^2} + \|p_\theta \theta_t\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)} (\|p_2(1 + \theta^2) \rho_t\|_{L^2} + \|p_1 \sqrt{\rho}(1 + \theta) \theta_t\|_{L^2}) \leq C c_1^4 c_5^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

Hence by virtue of (2.42), from (2.8), (2.25), (2.31) and (2.33)-(2.34), using Hölder's inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^t \|\nabla \theta(s)\|_{D^{1,q}}^2 ds \\
& \leq C c_6^2 \int_0^t (\|\rho h\|_{L^q}^2 + \|e_\theta\|_{L^\infty}^2 (\|\rho \theta_t\|_{L^q}^2 + \|\rho v \cdot \nabla \theta\|_{L^q}^2) + \|p \operatorname{div} v\|_{L^q}^2 \\
& \quad + \|Q(\sigma, \eta, v)\|_{L^q}^2 + \|e_\rho\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^4 \|\nabla v\|_{L^q}^2 + \|\nabla \theta\|_{L^q}^2 + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{\frac{5q-6}{q-3}} \|\theta\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)}^2) ds \\
& \leq C c_6^2 \int_0^t [c_0^2 \|h\|_{L^q}^2 + c_0^2 c_5^2 (\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\theta_t\|_{D_0^1}^2) + c_0^8 c_5^2 + c_5^2 \|\nabla v\|_{W^{1,q}}^2 + c_0^2 c_5^{\frac{5q-6}{q-3}}] ds \\
& \leq C c_0^6 c_1 c_5^4 c_6^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$.

III. Estimates for the velocity.

To derive estimates for the velocity u , we differentiate the equation (2.2) with respect to t , multiply it by u_t and integrate it over Ω , using the equation (2.1), then derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int \rho |u_t|^2 dx + \int (\mu [\nabla u_t + \nabla u_t^\top] : \nabla u_t + \lambda (\operatorname{div} u_t)^2) dx \\
& = \int u_t \cdot [-\nabla p_t + (\rho f)_t - \rho_t v \cdot \nabla u - \rho v_t \cdot \nabla u + \operatorname{div}(\rho v) u_t \\
& \quad + \operatorname{div}(\mu_t (\nabla u + \nabla u^\top) + \nabla(\lambda_t \operatorname{div} u))] dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.55}$$

Using the technique in [12], we can estimate the second term in the left hand side of (2.55) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int (\mu [\nabla u_t + \nabla u_t^\top] : \nabla u_t + \lambda (\operatorname{div} u_t)^2) dx \\
& \geq \int (\mu [\nabla u_t + \nabla u_t^\top] : \nabla u_t - \frac{2}{3} \mu (\operatorname{div} u_t)^2) dx \\
& = \int \frac{\mu}{2} |\nabla u_t + \nabla u_t^\top - \frac{2}{3} \operatorname{div} u_t I|^2 dx \\
& \geq \frac{\mu^0}{2} \int |\nabla u_t + \nabla u_t^\top - \frac{2}{3} \operatorname{div} u_t I|^2 dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int (\mu^0 [\nabla u_t + \nabla u_t^\top] : \nabla u_t - \frac{2}{3} \mu^0 (\operatorname{div} u_t)^2) dx \\
&= \int (\mu^0 |\nabla u_t|^2 + \frac{1}{3} \mu^0 (\operatorname{div} u_t)^2) dx \geq \int \mu^0 |\nabla u_t|^2 dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

Using Hölder, Young and Sobolev's inequalities, we easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^0 \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq C(\|p_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + (1 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^3}^2) \|f_t\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + \|\rho_t\|_{L^3}^2 \|f\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + \|\rho_t\|_{L^3}^2 \|v\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}^2) + Cc_1 \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{D^1} \\
&\quad + c_1^{-1} \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2}^2 \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\|\mu_t\|_{L^3}^2 + \|\lambda_t\|_{L^3}^2) \|u\|_{D^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from the estimates (2.8), (2.25), (2.31)-(2.32), (2.35) and (2.53) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq Cc_1^8 c_5^4 + Cc_0^2 \|f_t\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + (Cc_0^3 + c_1^{-1} \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2}^2) \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + C(c_0^6 + c_0^2 c_1^2) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + Cc_5^2 (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}) \|u\|_{D^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$. Hence, using the facts that

$$\rho(\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [L(\sigma(\tau), \eta(\tau), u(\tau)) + \nabla p(\rho(\tau), \theta(\tau))] \rightarrow g_2 \text{ in } L^2 \text{ as } \tau \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\|u(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2 \leq C\|u_0\|_{D_0^1}^2 + C \int_0^t \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds \text{ for } 0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4),$$

we easily obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\
&\leq Cc_0^5 + C \int_0^t (c_0^4 c_1^2 + c_1^{-1} \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2}^2) (\|u\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}^2) ds \\
&\quad + Cc_5^2 \int_0^t (c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}) \|u\|_{D^2}^2 ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$.

To estimate $\|u\|_{D^2}$, we apply the elliptic regularity result (2.41) to the equation (2.2). Then, it follows from (2.8), (2.25), (2.31)-(2.34) and (2.52) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{D^2} &\leq Cc_6 (\|\rho f\|_{L^2} + \|\rho u_t\|_{L^2} + \|\rho v \cdot \nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla p\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-3}}}^{\frac{q}{q-3}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq Cc_6 [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|f\|_{L^2} + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2} + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + c_0^3 c_5 + \|u\|_{D_0^1} + c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}] \\
&\leq Cc_6 [c_0 + c_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2} + c_0^3 c_5 + (c_0^2 + c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}}) \|u\|_{D_0^1}] \\
&\leq Cc_0^3 c_5 c_6 + Cc_0^2 c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}} c_6 (\|u\|_{D_0^1} + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t\|_{L^2}),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$. Therefore, substituting this into (2.57), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ & \leq Cc_0^5 + C \int_0^t (c_0^4 c_5^{\frac{3q}{q-3}} c_6^2 (c_1^2 c_3^2 + c_3 \|\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}) + c_1^{-1} \|\nabla v_t\|_{L^2}^2) (\|u\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}u_t\|_{L^2}^2) ds. \end{aligned}$$

and using Gronwall's inequality, we obtain that

$$\|u(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}u_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_t(s)\|_{D_0^1}^2 ds \leq Cc_0^5 \exp\{C + Cc_0^4 c_3^{\frac{3}{2}} c_5^{\frac{3q}{q-3}} c_6^2 t^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \leq Cc_0^5, \quad (2.59)$$

and

$$\|u(t)\|_{D^2} \leq Cc_0^5 c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}} c_6, \quad (2.60)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$.

Moreover, it follows from (2.43) that if $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{D^{2,q}} & \leq Cc_6(c_0\|f\|_{L^q} + c_0(\|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}u_t\|_{L^2} + \|u_t\|_{D_0^1}) + c_0^7 c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}} c_6 + c_5^{\frac{5q-6}{2q-6}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}) \\ & \leq Cc_6(c_0\|f\|_{L^q} + c_0^{\frac{7}{2}} + c_0\|u_t\|_{D_0^1} + c_0^7 c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}} c_6 + c_5^{\frac{5q-6}{2q-6}} c_0^{\frac{5}{2}}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 ds \leq Cc_0^7 c_6^2, \quad (2.61)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$.

Combining (2.59)-(2.61), we finally conclude that

$$\|u(t)\|_{D_0^1} + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}u_t(t)\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t (\|u_t(s)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|u(s)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2) ds \leq A_2 c_0^7 c_6^2, \quad (2.62)$$

and

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2} \leq A_2 c_0^5 c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}} c_6, \quad (2.63)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \min(T, T_4)$. Here, the constant $A_2 > 1$ is independent of any one of c_i , $i = 0, \dots, 6$.

IV. Conclusion.

Let us define c_1 , c_2 and c_3 by

$$c_1 = A_2 c_0^7 c_6^2, \quad c_2 = A_2 c_0^5 c_5^{\frac{q}{q-3}} c_6 \text{ and } c_3 = A_1 c_2^8 c_5^{\frac{2q}{q-3}} c_6. \quad (2.64)$$

Then choosing any T_{***} such that $0 < T_{***} \leq \min(T, T_4)$, we conclude from (2.32), (2.46)-(2.47), (2.54) and (2.62)-(2.63) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_{***}} (\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}}^2 + \|\rho_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q}) \leq c_4, \quad (2.65)$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_{***}]} (\|(\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + \|\theta(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2}) + \int_0^{T_{***}} \|\theta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 dt \leq c_3, \quad (2.66)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_{***}} (\|\theta(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1} + \|\sqrt{\rho}u_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}) + \int_0^{T_{***}} \|\theta(t, \cdot)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 dt \leq Cc_7, \quad (2.67)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_{***}} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1} + \int_0^{T_{***}} \left(\|u_t(s, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|u(s, \cdot)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 \right) ds \leq c_1, \quad (2.68)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_{***}} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2} ds \leq c_2, \quad (2.69)$$

where $c_7 = c_0^6 c_1 c_5^4 c_6^2$. Using similar arguments in (2.27)-(2.29), we have

$$\|(\theta(t, \cdot) - \theta_0(\cdot), u(t, \cdot) - u_0(\cdot))\|_{D_0^1} \leq C c_3^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.70)$$

and

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^6} \leq C c_0^2 t^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (2.71)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T_{***}$. Hence, it deserves to emphasize that $c_1, \dots, c_7$ and T_{***} depend only on c_0 , but not on the lower bound δ of the initial density ρ_0 .

3 Existence result for the linearized problem

Now we can prove the key lemma to prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume in addition to (2.7)-(2.10) that the initial data (ρ_0, θ_0, u_0) satisfy the compatibility condition*

$$-\operatorname{div}(\kappa_0 \nabla \theta_0) - Q(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) = \rho_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g_1 \text{ and } L(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) + \nabla p(\rho_0, \theta_0) = \rho_0^{\frac{1}{2}} g_2, \quad (3.1)$$

for some $(g_1, g_2) \in L^2$. Assume further that

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma, \eta, v)(0) &= (\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0), \quad \sigma^\infty = \rho^\infty, \\ \sup_{t \in [0, T_{***}]} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1} + \int_0^{T_{***}} \left(\|v_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 \right) dt &\leq c_1 \\ \sup_{t \in [0, T_{***}]} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2} &\leq c_2, \\ \sup_{t \in [0, T_{***}]} (\|(\sqrt{\sigma} \eta_t)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + \|\eta(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2}) + \int_0^{T_{***}} \|\eta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 dt &\leq c_3, \\ \sup_{t \in [0, T_{***}]} (\|\sigma(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|\sigma_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q}) &\leq c_4, \end{aligned}$$

for the positive constants c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 and T_{***} , depend only on c_0 , chosen as before, where

$$c_0 = 2 + \rho^\infty + \|\rho_0 - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta_0, u_0)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} + \|(g_1, g_2)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Then there exists a unique strong solution (ρ, θ, u) to the linearized problem (2.1)-(2.6) in $[0, T_{***}]$ satisfying the estimates (2.65)-(2.71) as well as the regularity

$$\begin{aligned} \rho - \rho^\infty &\in C([0, T_{***}]; L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}), \quad \rho_t \in C([0, T_{***}]; L^2 \cap L^q), \\ (\theta, u) &\in C([0, T_{***}]; D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0, T_{***}; D^{2,q}), \\ (\theta_t, u_t) &\in L^2(0, T_{***}; D_0^1) \text{ and } (\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t, \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t) \in L^\infty([0, T_{***}]; L^2), \\ \|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta(t, \cdot) - \theta_0(\cdot), u(t, \cdot) - u_0(\cdot))\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} &\rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We define $\rho_0^\delta = \rho_0 + \delta$ for each $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Then from the compatibility condition (3.1), we derive

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\kappa(\rho_0, \theta_0) \nabla \theta_0) - Q(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) = (\rho_0^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} g_1^\delta, \\ L(\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) + \nabla p(\rho_0^\delta, \theta_0) = (\rho_0^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} g_2^\delta, \end{cases}$$

where

$$g_1^\delta = \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\rho_0^\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} g_1 \quad \text{and} \quad g_2^\delta = \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\rho_0^\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} g_2 + \frac{\nabla(p(\rho_0^\delta, \theta_0) - p(\rho_0, \theta_0))}{(\rho_0^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Since $p_\rho, p_\theta \in C^\alpha([0, \infty), L_{loc}^\infty([0, \infty)))$, $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, we obtain that for all small $\delta > 0$,

$$c_0 \geq 1 + (\rho^\infty + \delta) + \|\rho_0^\delta - (\rho^\infty + \delta)\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta_0, u_0)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} + \|(g_1^\delta, g_2^\delta)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Hence, from previous results for positive initial densities, we deduce that corresponding to the initial data $(\rho_0^\delta, \theta_0, u_0)$ with small $\delta > 0$, there exists a unique strong solution $(\rho^\delta, \theta^\delta, u^\delta)$ of the linearized equations (2.1)-(2.6) satisfying the local estimates (2.65)-(2.69). From this uniform estimates on δ , we conclude that there is a subsequence of the solutions $(\rho^\delta, \theta^\delta, u^\delta)$ which converges to a limit (ρ, θ, u) in an obvious weak or weak-* sense. It is easy to show that (ρ, θ, u) is a weak solution to the linearized equations (2.1)-(2.6) in $[0, T_{***}]$. Finally, thanks to the lower semi-continuity of various norms, we find that (ρ, θ, u) also satisfies the estimates (2.65)-(2.71). This proves the existence of a strong solution (ρ, θ, u) with the regularity

$$\rho - \rho^\infty \in L^\infty([0, T_{***}]; L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}), \quad \rho_t \in L^\infty([0, T_{***}]; L^2 \cap L^q), \quad (3.2)$$

$$(\theta, u) \in L^\infty([0, T_{***}]; D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0, T_{***}; D^{2,q}), \quad (3.3)$$

$$(\theta_t, u_t) \in L^2(0, T_{***}; D_0^1) \text{ and } (\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \theta_t, \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} u_t) \in L^\infty(0, T_{***}; L^2). \quad (3.4)$$

Now we prove the uniqueness of the solution to this regularity class. Let (ρ_1, θ_1, u_1) and (ρ_2, θ_2, u_2) be two solutions to the problem (2.1)-(2.6) satisfying the regularity (3.2)-(3.4), and we denote

$$\bar{\rho} = \rho_1 - \rho_2, \quad \bar{\theta} = \theta_1 - \theta_2, \quad \bar{u} = u_1 - u_2.$$

First, since $\bar{\rho} \in L^\infty(0, T_{***}; L^\infty)$ is a solution to the linear transport equation $\bar{\rho}_t + \operatorname{div}(\bar{\rho} v) = 0$, it follows from the uniqueness result by DiPerna-Lions in [11] that $\bar{\rho} = 0$, that is, $\rho_1 = \rho_2 := \rho$ in $[0, T_{***}] \times \Omega$. Next, to show that $\bar{\theta} = 0$ in $[0, T_{***}] \times \Omega$, we multiply the both sides of

$$e_\theta(\bar{\rho} \bar{\theta}_t + \bar{\rho} v \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}) - \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \bar{\theta}) + \operatorname{div} v(p(\rho, \theta_1) - p(\rho, \theta_2)) = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

by $\bar{\theta}$ and integrate over $(0, t) \times \Omega$. Then, since $\rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho v) = 0$ and $\bar{\theta}(0) = 0$ in Ω , we deduce at least formally that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int e_\theta \bar{\rho} |\bar{\theta}|^2 dx + \int_0^t \int \kappa |\nabla \bar{\theta}|^2 dx ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int \left[\partial_t e_\theta \bar{\rho} \bar{\theta}^2 + \nabla e_\theta \bar{\rho} v \bar{\theta}^2 - \bar{\theta} \operatorname{div} v(p(\rho, \theta_1) - p(\rho, \theta_2)) \right] dx ds \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa^0}{2} \int_0^t \int |\nabla \bar{\theta}|^2 dx ds + C \int_0^t \left[\|\partial_t e_\theta\|_{L^3}^2 + \|\nabla e_\theta\|_{L^3}^2 \|v\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla v\|_{L^3}^2 \|p_1\|_{L^\infty}^2 (1 + \|(\theta_1, \theta_2)\|_{L^\infty}^2) \right] \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}} \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2}^2 ds \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and applying Gronwall's inequality, we also conclude that $\bar{\theta} = 0$ in $(0, t) \times \Omega$. But this argument is somewhat formal since it is not obvious that $\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\theta} \in L^\infty(0, T_{***}; L^2)$ for the case of unbounded

domains. Hence we have to justify this formal argument by deriving (3.6) rigorously. For this purpose, we assume that Ω is an unbounded domain, let $\Omega_r = \Omega \cap B_r$, $r > 1$, and define $\bar{\theta}_r \in L^\infty(0, T_{***}; H_0^1(\Omega_r))$ by

$$\bar{\theta}_r(t, x) = \bar{\theta}(t, x)\phi_r(x) \text{ for } (t, x) \in [0, T_{***}] \times \Omega,$$

where $\phi_r(x) = \phi(\frac{x}{r})$ is a cut-off function satisfying $\phi \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$ and $\phi \equiv 1$ in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then from (3.5), we derive

$$e_\theta (\rho(\bar{\theta}_r)_t + \rho v \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}_r) - \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \bar{\theta})\phi_r + \operatorname{div}v(p(\rho, \theta_1) - p(\rho, \theta_2))\phi_r = e_\theta \rho \bar{\theta} v \cdot \nabla \phi_r.$$

Hence multiplying this by $\bar{\theta}_r$ and integrating over $[0, t] \times \Omega$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int e_\theta \rho |\bar{\theta}_r|^2(t) dx + \int_0^t \int \kappa |\nabla \bar{\theta}_r|^2 dx ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int \left[\partial_t e_\theta \rho \bar{\theta}_r^2 + \nabla e_\theta \rho v \bar{\theta}_r^2 - \bar{\theta}_r \phi_r \operatorname{div}v(p(\rho, \theta_1) - p(\rho, \theta_2)) \right] dx ds + I_r(t), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where the remainder term $I_r(t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |I_r(t)| &= \left| \int_0^t \int \kappa \bar{\theta}^2 (\nabla \phi_r)^2 + e_\theta \bar{\theta} \rho \bar{\theta}_r v \cdot \nabla \phi_r \right| \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \int \rho |e_\theta| |\bar{\theta}| |\bar{\theta}_r| |v| |\nabla \phi_r| + \kappa \bar{\theta}^2 |\nabla \phi_r|^2 dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $e_\theta, \kappa, \rho \in L^\infty(0, T_{***}; L^\infty)$ and $(\bar{\theta}, v) \in L^\infty(0, T_{***}; D_0^1)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |I_r(t)| \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \int_0^t \int \rho |\bar{\theta}_r|^2 dx ds + \frac{\tilde{C}}{r^2} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega_r} (\rho |\bar{\theta}|^2 |v|^2 + \bar{\theta}^2) dx ds \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \int_0^t \int \rho |\bar{\theta}_r|^2 dx ds + \frac{\tilde{C}}{r^2} \int_0^t \left[\|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\bar{\theta}^2\|_{L^3} \|v^2\|_{L^3} |\Omega_r|^{\frac{1}{3}} + \|\bar{\theta}\|_{L^6}^2 |\Omega_r|^{\frac{2}{3}} \right] ds \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \int_0^t \int \rho |\bar{\theta}_r|^2 dx ds + \tilde{C} \end{aligned}$$

where the positive constant $\tilde{C}$ is independent of r . Therefore, substituting this estimate into (3.7), using the similar argument in (3.6) and applying Gronwall's inequality, we conclude that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_{***}} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\theta}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\frac{r}{2}})}^2 + \int_0^{T_{***}} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\frac{r}{2}})}^2 dt \leq \tilde{C}.$$

Thus, we have $\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\theta} \in L^\infty(0, T_{***}; L^2(\Omega))$ and $\nabla \bar{\theta} \in L^2(0, T_{***}; L^2(\Omega))$. Now, we can estimate $I_r(t)$ again,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_r(t)| &\leq \tilde{C} \int_0^{T_{***}} \left(\|\nabla \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2} + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2} \|v\|_{L^\infty} \right) \|\nabla \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2(\Omega \setminus B_{\frac{r}{2}})} ds \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \left(\int_0^{T_{***}} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}\|_{L^2(\Omega \setminus B_{\frac{r}{2}})}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, letting $r \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.7), we could obtain the estimate (3.6) and $\bar{\theta} = 0$ in $(0, T_{***}) \times \Omega$. Similarly, we have $\bar{u} = 0$. This completes the proof of the uniqueness.

Finally, we prove the time-continuity of the solution (ρ, θ, u) with the regularities (3.2)-(3.4). From Lemma 2.1, we have $\rho \in C([0, T_{***}]; L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q})$. From (2.1) and $v \in C([0, T_{***}]; D_0^1 \cap D^2)$, we can obtain $\rho_t \in C([0, T_{***}]; L^2 \cap L^q)$. To show the time-continuity of (θ, u) , we first observe that $(\theta, u) \in C([0, T_{***}]; D_0^1 \cap D^{1,q'}) \cap C([0, T_{***}]; D^2 - weak)$, $\forall q' \in (3, 6)$. From the equations (2.2)-(2.3), we also observe that $((e_\theta \rho \theta_t)_t, (\rho u_t)_t) \in L^2(0, T_{***}; H^{-1})$. Since $(e_\theta \rho \theta_t, \rho u_t) \in L^2(0, T_{***}; H_0^1)$, it follows immediately that $(e_\theta \rho \theta_t, \rho u_t) \in C(0, T_{***}; L^2)$. Hence we conclude that for each $t \in [0, T_{***}]$, $(\theta, u) = (\theta(t), u(t)) \in D_0^1 \cap D^2$ is a solution to the elliptic system $-\operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla e) = F$ and $L(\sigma, \eta, u) = G$ in Ω for some $(F, G) \in C([0, T_{***}]; L^2)$. Since $(\kappa, \mu, \lambda)(\sigma, \eta) \in C([0, T_{***}]; C^\beta \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q})$, using the elliptic regularity estimates (2.40)-(2.43), we easily show that $(\theta, u) \in C([0, T_{***}]; D^2)$. From this time-continuity of the solution (ρ, θ, u) and the estimates (2.70)-(2.71), we obtain

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta(t, \cdot) - \theta_0(\cdot), u(t, \cdot) - u_0(\cdot))\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

We have completed the proof of Lemma 3.1. $\square$

4 Existence result for polytropic fluids

In this section, we consider the following initial boundary value problem for a viscous polytropic fluid:

$$\rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\rho u_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla u + L(\rho, \theta, u) + \nabla p = \rho f, \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times \Omega, \quad (4.2)$$

$$e_\theta(\rho \theta_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla \theta) - \operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla \theta) + p \operatorname{div} u = Q(\rho, \theta, u) + \rho h + e_\rho \rho^2 \operatorname{div} u, \quad (4.3)$$

$$(\rho, \theta, u)|_{t=0} = (\rho_0, \theta_0, u_0) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (4.4)$$

$$(\theta, u) = (0, 0) \quad \text{on } (0, \infty) \times \partial\Omega, \quad (4.5)$$

$$(\rho, \theta, u)(t, x) \rightarrow (\rho^\infty, 0, 0) \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.6)$$

where $Q(\rho, \theta, u) = \frac{\mu(\rho, \theta)}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^\top|^2 + \lambda(\rho, \theta) (\operatorname{div} u)^2$, $L(\rho, \theta, u) = -\operatorname{div}(\mu(\rho, \theta) (\nabla u + \nabla u^\top)) - \nabla(\lambda(\rho, \theta) \operatorname{div} u)$ and $(e_\theta, e_\rho, p, \mu, \lambda, \kappa) = (e_\theta, e_\rho, p, \mu, \lambda, \kappa)(\rho, \theta)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1

Our proof will be based on the usual iteration argument and results in Lemma 3.1. Let us denote

$$c_0 = 2 + \rho^\infty + \|\rho_0 - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta_0, u_0)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} + \|(g_1, g_2)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and we choose the positive constants c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 and T_4 as in Section 2, depend only on c_0 . Next, let $u^0 \in C([0, \infty); D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0, \infty; D^3)$ be the solution to the linear parabolic problem

$$w_t - \Delta w = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times \Omega \quad \text{and } w(0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then, chose a small time $T_5 \in (0, T_4]$, such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_5} \|u^0(t)\|_{D_0^1} + \int_0^{T_5} \left(\|u_t^0(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|u^0(t)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 \right) dt \leq c_1,$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_5} \|u^0\|_{D^2} \leq c_2.$$

Hence, choosing $T = T_5$ in Section 2, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that there exists a unique strong solution (ρ^1, e^1, u^1) to the linearized problem (2.1)-(2.6) with (σ, η, v) replaced by (ρ_0, θ_0, u^0) , which satisfies the regularity estimates (2.65)-(2.71) with T_{***} replaced by T_5 . Similarly, we construct approximate solutions (ρ^k, θ^k, u^k) as follows: assuming that $(\rho^{k-1}, \theta^{k-1}, u^{k-1})$ was defined for $k \geq 2$, let (ρ^k, θ^k, u^k) be the unique solution to the linearized problem (2.1)-(2.6) with (σ, η, v) replaced by $(\rho^{k-1}, \theta^{k-1}, u^{k-1})$. Then it also follows from Lemma 3.1 that there exists a constant $\tilde{C} > 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_5} \left(\|\rho^k(t) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|\rho_t^k(t)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \right) \\ & + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_5} \|(\theta^k, u^k)(t)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_5} \|(\sqrt{\rho^k} \theta_t^k, \sqrt{\rho^k} u_t^k)\|_{L^2} \\ & + \int_0^{T_5} \left(\|(\theta_t^k, u_t^k)(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|(\theta^k, u^k)(t)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 \right) dt \leq \tilde{C} \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

$$\|(\theta^k(t, \cdot) - \theta_0(\cdot), u^k(t, \cdot) - u_0(\cdot))\|_{D_0^1} \leq \tilde{C} t^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\|\rho^k(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^6} \leq \tilde{C} t^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (4.9)$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Throughout the proof, we denote by $\tilde{C}$ a generic constant depending only on c_0 , but independent of k .

From now on, we show that the sequence (ρ^k, θ^k, u^k) converges to a solution to the original nonlinear problem (4.1)-(4.6) in a strong sense. Let us define

$$\bar{\rho}^{k+1} = \rho^{k+1} - \rho^k, \quad \bar{\theta}^{k+1} = \theta^{k+1} - \theta^k, \quad \bar{u}^{k+1} = u^{k+1} - u^k.$$

Then, from (4.1)-(4.3), we derive equations for functions $(\bar{\rho}^{k+1}, \bar{\theta}^{k+1}, \bar{u}^{k+1})$,

$$\bar{\rho}_t^{k+1} + \operatorname{div}(\bar{\rho}^{k+1} u^k) + \operatorname{div}(\rho^k \bar{u}^k) = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho^{k+1} \bar{u}_t^{k+1} + \rho^{k+1} u^k \cdot \nabla \bar{u}^{k+1} + L(\rho^k, \theta^k, \bar{u}^{k+1}) \\ = & \bar{\rho}^{k+1} (f - u_t^k - u^{k-1} \cdot \nabla u^k) - \rho^{k+1} \bar{u}^k \cdot \nabla u^k + \nabla(p^k - p^{k+1}) \\ & + \operatorname{div}((\mu^k - \mu^{k-1})(\nabla u^k + (\nabla u^k)^\top)) \\ & + \nabla((\lambda^k - \lambda^{k-1}) \operatorname{div} u^k), \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & e_\theta^k \left(\rho^{k+1} \bar{\theta}_t^{k+1} + \rho^{k+1} u^k \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1} \right) - \operatorname{div}(\kappa^k \nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}) \\ = & \operatorname{div}((\kappa^k - \kappa^{k-1}) \nabla \theta^k) + Q(\rho^k, \theta^k, u^k) - Q(\rho^{k-1}, \theta^{k-1}, u^{k-1}) \\ & + \bar{\rho}^{k+1} h + p^k \operatorname{div} u^{k-1} - p^{k+1} \operatorname{div} u^k + e_\theta^{k-1} \rho^k (\theta_t^k + u^{k-1} \cdot \nabla \theta^k) \\ & - e_\theta^k \rho^{k+1} (\theta_t^k + u^k \cdot \nabla \theta^k) + e_\rho^k (\rho^{k+1})^2 \operatorname{div} u^k - e_\rho^{k-1} (\rho^k)^2 \operatorname{div} u^{k-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where $(e_\theta^k, e_\rho^k, p^k, \kappa^k, \mu^k, \lambda^k) = (e_\theta, e_\rho, p, \kappa, \mu, \lambda)(\rho^k, \theta^k)$.

First, we consider the case that $\rho^\infty > 0$. Multiplying (4.10) by $\bar{\rho}^{k+1}$ and integrating over Ω , we obtain (at least formally) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}|^2 dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \int \left(|\nabla u^k| |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}|^2 + |\nabla \rho^k| |\bar{u}^k| |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| + \rho^k |\nabla \bar{u}^k| |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| \right) dx \\
&\leq C \left(\|\nabla u^k\|_{W^{1,q}} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + (\|\nabla \rho^k\|_{L^3} + \|\rho^k\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by virtue of Young's inequality, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq A_\epsilon^k(t) \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.13)$$

where $A_\epsilon^k(t) = C \|\nabla u^k(t)\|_{W^{1,q}} + \epsilon^{-1} C (\|\nabla \rho^k(t)\|_{L^3}^2 + \|\rho^k(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2)$. From the estimate (4.7), we have $A_\epsilon^k(t) \in L^1(0, T_5)$ and $\int_0^t A_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C} + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T_5]$. Here we denote by $\tilde{C}_\epsilon$ a generic positive constant depending only on ϵ^{-1} and the parameters of $\tilde{C}$, where $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ is a small number.

Next, multiplying (4.11) by $\bar{u}^{k+1}$ and integrating over Ω , recalling that

$$(\rho^{k+1})_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho^{k+1} u^k) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

and using the technique in the proof of (2.56), we have (at least formally) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int \rho^{k+1} |\bar{u}^{k+1}|^2 dx + \mu^0 \int |\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}|^2 dx \\
&\leq C \int \left[|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| (|f| + |u_t^k| + |u^{k-1} \cdot \nabla u^k|) |\bar{u}^{k+1}| + |\rho^{k+1}| |\bar{u}^k| |\nabla u^k| |\bar{u}^{k+1}| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |p^{k+1} - p^k| |\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}| + (|\mu^k - \mu^{k-1}| + |\lambda^k - \lambda^{k-1}|) |\nabla u^k| |\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}| \right] dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using Hölder, Sobolev and Young's inequalities, it also follows from (4.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1}} \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^0 \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq B_\epsilon^k(t) \left(\|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1}} \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1}} \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \tilde{C}_\epsilon \|\sqrt{\rho^k} \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + C \int |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| |u_t^k| |\bar{u}^{k+1}| dx,
\end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where $B_\epsilon^k(t) \in L^1(0, T_5)$ such that $\int_0^t B_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C} + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_5$ and $k \geq 1$.

Finally, multiplying (4.12) by $\bar{\theta}^{k+1}$, integrating over Ω and recalling that

$$(\rho^{k+1})_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho^{k+1} u^k) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

we obtain (at least formally) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int e_\theta^k \rho^{k+1} |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}|^2 dx + \kappa^0 \int |\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}|^2 dx \\
&\leq C \int \left\{ |\kappa^k - \kappa^{k-1}| |\nabla \bar{\theta}^k| |\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}| + (|\mu^k| + |\lambda^k|) \left(|\nabla u^k| + |\nabla u^{k-1}| \right) |\nabla \bar{u}^k| |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}| \right. \\
&\quad + |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}| |\nabla u^{k-1}|^2 \left(|\mu^k - \mu^{k-1}| + |\lambda^k - \lambda^{k-1}| \right) + |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| |h| |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}| \\
&\quad + |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}| \left| p^k \operatorname{div} u^{k-1} - p^{k+1} \operatorname{div} u^k + e_\theta^{k-1} \rho^k (\theta_t^k + u^{k-1} \cdot \nabla \theta^k) - e_\theta^k \rho^{k+1} (\theta_t^k + u^k \cdot \nabla \theta^k) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + e_\rho^k (\rho^{k+1})^2 \operatorname{div} u^k - e_\rho^{k-1} (\rho^k)^2 \operatorname{div} u^{k-1} + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_t e_\theta^k + u^k \cdot \nabla e_\theta^k) \rho^{k+1} \bar{\theta}^{k+1} \right| \right\} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

From (4.7), using Hölder, Sobolev and Young's inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{e_\theta^k \rho^{k+1}} \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa^0 \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq D_\epsilon^k(t) \left(\|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1}} \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \tilde{C}_\epsilon \|\sqrt{\rho^k} \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \quad + \tilde{C} \|\sqrt{\rho^k} \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \tilde{C} \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0 \epsilon}{8} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \tilde{C} \int |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| |\theta_t^k| |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}| dx
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

where $D_\epsilon^k(t) \in L^1(0, T_5)$ such that $\int_0^t D_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C} + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t$ and $k \geq 1$.

Therefore, combining (4.13)-(4.15), defining

$$\psi^{k+1}(t) = \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa^0} \|\sqrt{e_\theta^k \rho^{k+1}} \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1}} \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt} (\psi^{k+1} + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2) + \epsilon \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^0 \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq E_\epsilon^k(t) \left(\psi^{k+1} + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \tilde{C}_\epsilon \psi^k + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + 3\epsilon \tilde{C} (\|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2) \\
& \quad + \tilde{C} \int |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| \left(\epsilon |\theta_t^k| |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}| + |u_t^k| |\bar{u}^{k+1}| \right) dx,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

where $E_\epsilon^k(t) \in L^1(0, T_5)$ such that $\int_0^t E_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C} + \tilde{C}t$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_5$ and $k \geq 2$.

To estimate the last integral term in (4.16), we assume that Ω is an unbounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and Claim that there exists a large radius $R_0 > 0$ and a small time $T_6 \in (0, T_5]$ independent of k , such that

$$\frac{1}{4} \rho^\infty \leq \rho^{k+1}(t, x) \leq 4\rho^\infty, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T_6] \times (\Omega \setminus B_{R_0}). \tag{4.17}$$

From (4.17), we can estimate the integral term in (4.16) as follows: for $0 \leq t \leq T_6$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{C} \int_{\Omega \cap B_{R_0}} |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| \left(\epsilon |\theta_t^k| |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}| + |u_t^k| |\bar{u}^{k+1}| \right) dx \\
& \leq \tilde{C} \left(\|\nabla \theta_t^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u_t^k\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\epsilon \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^0 \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{C} \int_{\Omega \setminus B_{R_0}} |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}| \left(\epsilon |\theta_t^k| |\bar{\theta}^{k+1}| + |u_t^k| |\bar{u}^{k+1}| \right) dx \\
& \leq \tilde{C} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2} \left(\epsilon \|\theta_t^k\|_{L^6} \|\bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^3} + \|u_t^k\|_{L^6} \|\bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^3} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\tilde{C} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}}{(\rho^\infty)^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\epsilon \|\nabla \theta_t^k\|_{L^2} \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1}} \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\nabla u_t^k\|_{L^2} \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1}} \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
& \leq \tilde{C}(\rho^\infty) \left(\|\nabla \theta_t^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u_t^k\|_{L^2}^2 + 1 \right) \psi^{k+1} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\epsilon \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^0 \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $\tilde{C}(\rho^\infty)$ depend also on ρ^∞ . Therefore, substituting these estimates into (4.16), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\psi^{k+1} + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\mu^0}{2} \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2$$

$$\leq F_\epsilon^k(t) \left(\psi^{k+1} + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \tilde{C}_\epsilon \psi^k + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + 3\epsilon \tilde{C} (\|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2) \quad (4.18)$$

where $F_\epsilon^k \in L^1(0, T_6)$, such that $\int_0^t F_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C}(\rho^\infty) + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t$ for $k \geq 2$ and $0 \leq t \leq T_6$. It is easy to see that this estimate holds also for a bounded domain Ω since we can choose a sufficiently large R_0 satisfying $\Omega \subset B_{R_0}$.

Now, we can prove (4.17) as follows. Since $\rho_0 - \rho^\infty \in L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q} \hookrightarrow C_0$, where the space C_0 consists of continuous functions on Ω vanishing at infinity, we can choose a large radius $R_0 > 1$ independent of k , so that

$$\frac{1}{2} \rho^\infty \leq \rho_0(x) \leq 2\rho^\infty, \quad \forall x \in \Omega \setminus B_{\frac{R_0}{2}}. \quad (4.19)$$

From Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\rho^{k+1}(t, x) = \rho_0(U^{k+1}(0, t, x)) \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \operatorname{div} u^k(s, U^{k+1}(s, t, x)) ds \right\}, \quad (4.20)$$

where $U^{k+1}(t, s, x)$ is the solution to the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} U^{k+1}(t, s, x) &= u^k(t, U^{k+1}(t, s, x)), & t \in [0, T_5], \\ U^{k+1}(s, s, x) &= x, & s \in [0, T_5], \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, in view of (4.7), we deduce that

$$\int_0^t |\operatorname{div} u^k(s, U^{k+1}(s, t, x))| ds \leq \int_0^t \|\nabla u^k(s)\|_{L^\infty} ds \leq \tilde{C} t^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |U^{k+1}(0, t, x) - x| &= |U^{k+1}(0, t, x) - U^{k+1}(t, t, x)| \\ &\leq \int_0^t |u^k(\tau, U^{k+1}(\tau, t, x))| \tau \leq \tilde{C} t, \end{aligned}$$

for all $(t, x) \in [0, T_5] \times \Omega$. Letting $T_6 = \min(T_5, \tilde{C}^{-2}(\ln 2)^2, \frac{1}{2}\tilde{C}^{-1}R_0)$ is a small positive time dependent only on T_5 and the parameters $\tilde{C}$, we obtain

$$\int_0^t |\operatorname{div} u^k(s, U^{k+1}(s, t, x))| ds \leq \ln 2, \quad \text{and} \quad |U^{k+1}(0, t, x) - x| \leq \frac{R_0}{2},$$

for all $(t, x) \in [0, T_6] \times \Omega$. In particular, it follows that if $0 \leq t \leq T_6$ and $x \in \Omega \setminus B_{R_0}$, then $U^{k+1}(0, t, x) \in \Omega \setminus B_{\frac{R_0}{2}}$. Hence the desired result (4.17) follows immediately from (4.19)-(4.20).

Now, recalling that $\psi^{k+1}(0) = 0$ and using Gronwall's inequality, we deduce from (4.18) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi^{k+1} + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t \frac{\mu^0}{2} \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ & \leq \tilde{C}_\epsilon \int_0^t \psi^k(s) ds \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \int_0^t \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 ds + 3\epsilon \tilde{C} \int_0^t (\|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2) ds \right) \exp \left(\tilde{C}(\rho^\infty) + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t \right) \\ & \leq \tilde{C}_\epsilon \int_0^t \psi^k(s) ds \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \tilde{C}\epsilon \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \int_0^t \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{\mu^0}{2} \int_0^t (\|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2) ds \right) \exp \left(\tilde{C}(\rho^\infty) + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t \right),$$

for $k \geq 2$ and $0 \leq t \leq T_6$. Hence choosing small constants $\epsilon > 0$ satisfying $\tilde{C}\epsilon \exp(\tilde{C}(\rho^\infty)) = \frac{1}{8}$, and $T_7 \in (0, T_6]$ satisfying $\exp(\tilde{C}_\epsilon T_7) = 2$, we easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi^{k+1} + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t \frac{\mu^0}{2} \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ & \leq \tilde{C} \int_0^t \psi^k(s) ds + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \int_0^t \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \frac{\mu^0}{2} \int_0^t (\|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k-1}\|_{L^2}^2) ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

for $k \geq 2$ and $0 \leq t \leq T_7$. Using similar arguments as in the proof of (4.13)-(4.15), we can obtain $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_7} \psi^2(t) \leq \tilde{C}$ easily. Fixing a large $K > 1$, summing this over $2 \leq k \leq K$ and using Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=2}^K \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_7} \psi^{k+1}(t) + \sum_{k=2}^K \int_0^{T_7} \left(\epsilon \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^0 \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) dt \\ & \leq \tilde{C} \left(1 + \int_0^{T_7} \psi^2(s) ds \right) \leq \tilde{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_*} \psi^{k+1}(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{T_*} \left(\epsilon \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^0 \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) dt \leq \tilde{C} < \infty,$$

where $T_* = T_7$.

Therefore, we conclude that the full sequence (ρ^k, θ^k, u^k) converges to a limit (ρ, θ, u) in the following strong sense:

$$\begin{cases} \rho^k - \rho^1 \rightarrow \rho - \rho^1 & \text{in } L^\infty(0, T_*; L^2) \\ (\theta^k, u^k) \rightarrow (\theta, u) & \text{in } L^2(0, T_*; D_0^1). \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

It is easy to show that the limit (ρ, θ, u) is a weak solution to the original nonlinear problem (4.1)-(4.6). Furthermore, it follows from (4.7) that (ρ, θ, u) satisfies the following regularity estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_*} \|(\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t, \sqrt{\rho}u_t)(t)\|_{L^2} + \int_0^{T_*} \left(\|(\theta_t, u_t)(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|(\theta, u)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 \right) dt \\ & + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_*} \left(\|\rho(t) - \rho^\infty\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|\rho_t(t)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + \|(\theta, u)(t)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} \right) \leq \tilde{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Then adapting same arguments in the Lemma 3.1, we can easily prove the time-continuity of the solution (ρ, θ, u) and

$$\|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|(\theta(t, \cdot) - \theta_0(\cdot), u(t, \cdot) - u_0(\cdot))\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

This proves the existence of a strong solution. Now we prove the uniqueness of the strong solutions. Let (ρ_1, θ_1, u_1) and (ρ_2, θ_2, u_2) be two strong solutions to the problem (4.1)-(4.6) with the regularities (1.17)-(1.19) and we denote by $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{u})$ their difference. Then following the argument used to derive (4.18), we easily deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\|\bar{\rho}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{e_\theta(\rho_1, \theta_1)\rho_1}\bar{\theta}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho_1}\bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \frac{\kappa^0}{2} \|\bar{\theta}\|_{D_0^1} + \tilde{C} \|\bar{u}\|_{D_0^1}$$

$$\leq G(t) \left(\|\bar{\rho}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{e_\theta(\rho_1, \theta_1)\rho_1\bar{\theta}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho_1\bar{u}}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)$$

where $G(t) \in L^1(0, T_*)$. Therefore, using Gronwall's inequality, we conclude that $\bar{\rho} = \bar{\theta} = \bar{u} = 0$ in $(0, T_{***}) \times \Omega$. This completes the proof of the existence and uniqueness part for the case that $\rho^\infty > 0$.

Now we consider the case that $\rho^\infty = 0$. To prove the convergence in this case, we need to modify slightly previous arguments. First, multiplying (4.10) by $\text{sgn}(\bar{\rho}^{k+1})|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and integrating over Ω , we obtain (at least formally) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}|^{\frac{3}{2}} dx &\leq C \int |\nabla u^k| |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}|^{\frac{3}{2}} + (|\nabla \rho^k| |\bar{u}^k| + \rho^k |\nabla \bar{u}^k|) |\bar{\rho}^{k+1}|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u^k\|_{W^{1,q}} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{3}{2}} + C \|\rho^k\|_{L^6 \cap D^1} \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, multiplying this by $\|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2 \leq A_\epsilon^k(t) \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}}}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.22)$$

where $A_\epsilon^k(t) = C \|\nabla u^k(t)\|_{W^{1,q}} + \epsilon^{-1} C \|\rho^k(t)\|_{D_0^1}^2$. The uniform bound (4.7) implies that $\int_0^t A_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C} + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T_5]$. In a similar manner, we can also show that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq B_\epsilon^k(t) \|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (4.23)$$

where $B_\epsilon^k(t) \in L^1(0, T_5)$ such that $\int_0^t B_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C} + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T_5]$.

Next, multiplying (4.12) by $\bar{\theta}^{k+1}$ and integrating over Ω , using similar arguments as in the proof of (4.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{e_\theta^k \rho^{k+1} \bar{\theta}^{k+1}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa^0 \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq D_\epsilon^k(t) \left(\|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}} \cap L^2}^2 + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1} \bar{\theta}^{k+1}}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) + \tilde{C} \|\sqrt{\rho^k \bar{u}^k}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}_\epsilon \|\sqrt{\rho^k \bar{\theta}^k}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa^0 \epsilon}{8} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \tilde{C} \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall k \geq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where $D_\epsilon^k(t) \in L^1(0, T_5)$ such that $\int_0^t D_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C} + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t$.

Finally, from (4.11), using similar arguments as in the proof of (4.14), we easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1} \bar{u}^{k+1}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu^0 \|\nabla \bar{u}^{k+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq E_\epsilon^k(t) \left(\|\bar{\rho}^{k+1}\|_{L^{\frac{3}{2}} \cap L^2}^2 + \|\bar{\rho}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1} \bar{u}^{k+1}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho^{k+1} \bar{\theta}^{k+1}}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}_\epsilon \|\sqrt{\rho^k \bar{\theta}^k}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \|\nabla \bar{\theta}^k\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon \|\nabla \bar{u}^k\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where $E_\epsilon^k(t) \in L^1(0, T_5)$ such that $\int_0^t E_\epsilon^k(s) ds \leq \tilde{C} + \tilde{C}_\epsilon t$ for $k \geq 1$.

From (4.22)-(4.25), using same arguments in the proof of (4.21), we can show that there exists a small time $T_* \in (0, T_5]$, such that the sequence (ρ^k, θ^k, u^k) also converges to a limit (ρ, θ, u) in the sense of

$$\begin{cases} \rho^k - \rho^1 \rightarrow \rho - \rho^1 & \text{in } L^\infty(0, T_*; L^2 \cap L^{\frac{3}{2}}) \\ (\theta^k, u^k) \rightarrow (\theta, u) & \text{in } L^2(0, T_*; D_0^1). \end{cases}$$

Then adapting previous arguments for the case $\rho^\infty > 0$, we can easily prove that (ρ, θ, u) is a unique solution to the problem (4.1)-(4.6) with the regularities (1.17)-(1.20).

It remains to prove the blow-up criterion (1.21). To prove this, suppose that $T^* < \infty$, and let us introduce define by

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(t) &= 1 + \|\sqrt{\rho}\theta_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|\nabla\theta_t(s, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \|\rho(t, \cdot) - \rho^\infty(\cdot)\|_{L^6 \cap D^1 \cap D^{1,q}} + \|\theta(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1 \cap D^{1,6}} + \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1},\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(t) &= \|\rho_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} + \|\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}u_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} + \|(\theta, u)(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2} \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|u_t(\tau, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 + \|(\theta, u)(\tau, \cdot)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 d\tau,\end{aligned}$$

and $J(t) = \Phi(t) + \Psi(t)$, for $0 < t < T^*$. Let τ be a fixed time in $(0, T^*)$. Then (ρ, θ, u) is a strong solution to the equations (4.1)-(4.6) in $[\tau, T^*) \times \Omega$, which satisfy (1.17)-(1.19).

If (1.21) is not hold. We can find a constant K such that

$$J(\tau) + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T^*} \Phi(t) \leq K. \quad (4.26)$$

Hence, following similar arguments as in Section 2 with $T = T^*$, we can prove the analogues of (2.57), (2.58) and (2.61): for each $t \in (\tau, T^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned}& \|(\sqrt{\rho}u_t)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_t(s, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 ds \\ & \leq C_K(1 + T^*) + \int_0^t [C_K(1 + \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2)(\|u\|_{D^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}^2) + \|u\|_{D^{2,q}}^2] ds, \quad (4.27)\end{aligned}$$

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2} \leq C_K(1 + \|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}), \quad (4.28)$$

and

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 \leq C_K(\epsilon)(1 + \|f\|_{L^q}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}) + \epsilon\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.29)$$

Combining (4.27)-(4.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \|(\sqrt{\rho}u_t)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_t(s, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 ds \\ & \leq C_K(1 + T^*) + C_K \int_0^t (1 + \|\nabla\theta_t\|_{L^2}^2) \|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 ds, \quad \forall t \in (\tau, T^*),\end{aligned}$$

and using the Gronwall's inequality, we obtain that for each $t \in (\tau, T^*)$,

$$\|(\sqrt{\rho}u_t)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|u_t(s, \cdot)\|_{D_0^1}^2 ds \leq C_K(1 + T^*).$$

From this estimate and (4.28)-(4.29), we have

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{D^1} + \int_0^t \|u(s, \cdot)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 ds \leq C_K(1 + T^*), \quad \forall t \in (\tau, T^*).$$

And using the estimates (2.32), (2.40)-(2.43), we obtain

$$\|\rho_t(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2 \cap L^q} \leq C_K,$$

$$\|\theta(t, \cdot)\|_{D^2} + \int_0^t \|\theta(s, \cdot)\|_{D^{2,q}}^2 ds \leq C_K(1 + T^*),$$

and

$$J(t) \leq C_K(1 + T^*), \quad (4.30)$$

for all $t \in (\tau, T^*)$. It is a contradiction, because the maximality of T^* implies that $J(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow T^*$. So (1.21) must be hold. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Remark 4.1. By similar arguments in Lemma 3.1, using the cut-off function, we could prove that $\bar{\rho}^k, \bar{\rho} \in L^\infty(0, T_*; L^2)$ or $\bar{\rho}^k, \bar{\rho} \in L^\infty(0, T_*; L^{\frac{3}{2}} \cap L^2)$, and $\sqrt{\rho^k} \bar{\theta}^k, \sqrt{\rho^k} \bar{u}^k, \sqrt{\rho_1} \bar{\theta}, \sqrt{\rho_1} \bar{u} \in L^\infty(0, T_*; L^2)$ rigorously.

5 Some regularity results on elliptic system

In this section, we derive some regularity estimates for the so-called Lamé system:

$$P(\mu, \lambda, u) = -\operatorname{div}(\mu(\nabla u + \nabla u^\top)) - \nabla(\lambda \operatorname{div} u) = F, \quad (5.1)$$

and the elliptic system:

$$-\operatorname{div}(\kappa \nabla e) = G, \quad (5.2)$$

where Ω is a bounded or unbounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $(\kappa, \mu, \lambda)(x)$ satisfy

$$\mu(x) \geq \mu^0 > 0, \quad 3\lambda(x) + 2\mu(x) \geq 0, \quad \kappa(x) \geq \kappa^0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega. \quad (5.3)$$

The result in Theorem 1.1 rely crucially on these estimates.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary, and let $u \in D_0^1(\Omega) \cap D^{1,q}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the system (5.1), where $1 < q < \infty$. If $F \in L^q(\Omega)$, $(\mu, \lambda) \in C^\beta(\Omega)$ with $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u| \in L^q(\Omega)$, then $u \in D^{2,q}(\Omega)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right), \quad (5.4)$$

where $C = C(q, \mu^0, \Omega, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$ is a positive constant.

Proof. First, we consider the domain $\Omega_R = \Omega \cap B_R(x_0) \subset \subset \Omega$. We choose a function $\chi_0 \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_R)$ such that $\chi_0|_{\Omega_{\frac{R}{2}}} \equiv 1$ and $0 \leq \chi_0 \leq 1$. Letting $v_0 = \chi_0 u$, from (5.1), we have

$$-\mu(x_0)\Delta v_0 - (\lambda(x_0) + \mu(x_0))\nabla \operatorname{div} v_0 = F_1 + F_2, \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \chi_0 \left[F + \nabla \mu \cdot (\nabla u + \nabla u^\top) + \nabla \lambda \operatorname{div} u \right] - \mu(2(\nabla \chi_0 \cdot \nabla)u + \Delta \chi_0 u) \\ &\quad - (\lambda + \mu)(\nabla \chi_0 \operatorname{div} u + \nabla u \cdot \nabla \chi_0 + u \cdot \nabla \nabla \chi_0) \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$F_2 = (\mu(x) - \mu(x_0))\Delta v_0 + (\lambda(x) + \mu(x) - \lambda(x_0) - \mu(x_0))\nabla \operatorname{div} v_0. \quad (5.7)$$

From a well-known elliptic theory due to S. Agmon, A. Douglis and L. Nirenberg in [1], we have

$$\|v_0\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \left(\|F_1\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|F_2\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right) \quad (5.8)$$

where $C_1 = C_1(q, \mu^0, \Omega, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$. Since $\mu, \lambda \in C^\beta$, We have

$$\|F_2\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C_2 \sup_{x \in B_R} |x - x_0|^\beta \|v_0\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)},$$

and

$$\|v_0\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \left(\|F_1\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + C_2 \sup_{x \in B_R} |x - x_0|^\beta \|v_0\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)}, \right) \quad (5.9)$$

where $C_2 = C_2(\|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$. We can choose $R_0 > 0$ satisfying $C_1 C_2 R_0^\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega_{\frac{R}{2}})} &\leq \|v_0\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq 2C_1 \|F_1\|_{L^q} \\ &\leq C_3 (\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where $C_3 = C_3(q, \mu^0, \Omega, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$ and for all $0 < R \leq R_0$. Here, we use the Poincaré's inequality

$$\|u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)},$$

since $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. Second, we assume the $\Omega_1 = B_1(0) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^3$ and consider the domain $\Omega_r = B_r \cap \mathbb{R}_+^3$. We choose a function $\chi_1 \in C_0^\infty(B_r)$ such that $\chi_1|_{\Omega_{\frac{r}{2}}} \equiv 1$ and $0 \leq \chi_1 \leq 1$. Letting $v_1 = \chi_1 u$, using similar arguments in the proof of (5.10), we have that there exists a constant $r_0 > 0$, and

$$\|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega_{\frac{r}{2}})} \leq C_4 (\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}) \quad (5.11)$$

where $C_4 = C_4(q, \mu^0, \Omega_1, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$ and for all $0 < r \leq r_0$.

For the general bounded domain Ω , since $\partial\Omega \in C^\infty$, from (5.11), we easily obtain that for each $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, there exists $r_{x_0} > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{D^{2,q}(B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x_0) \cap \Omega)} \leq C_5 (\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}) \quad (5.12)$$

where $C_5 = C_5(q, \mu^0, \Omega, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$ and for all $0 < r \leq r_{x_0}$. Since Ω is a bounded domain, using the Finite Covering Theorem, we have

$$\|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq C_6 (\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)})$$

where $C_6 = C_6(q, \mu^0, \Omega, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\Omega_R = B_R$ or $B_R \cap \mathbb{R}_+^3$ with $R \geq 1$, and $u \in D_0^1(\Omega_R) \cap D^{1,q}(\Omega_R)$ be a weak solution to the system (5.1), where $1 < q < \infty$. If $F \in L^q(\Omega_R)$, $(\mu, \lambda) \in C^\beta(\Omega_R)$ with $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u| \in L^q(\Omega_R)$, then $u \in D^{2,q}(\Omega_R)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega_R)} \leq C (\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)}), \quad (5.13)$$

where $C = C(q, \mu^0, \Omega_1, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega_R)})$ is a positive constant, independent of R .

Proof. If we define $p = \frac{3}{1-\beta} > 3$, $v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega_1)$ by $v(x) = u(Rx)$, $\mu_R(x) = R^{\frac{3}{p}-1}\mu(Rx)$ and $\lambda_R(x) = R^{\frac{3}{p}-1}\lambda(Rx)$ for $x \in \Omega_1$, then we have:

$$P(\mu_R, \lambda_R, v) = R^{\frac{3}{p}+1}F(Rx) = F_R \text{ for } x \in \Omega_1.$$

Hence, it follows from Lemma 5.1 and the fact $\|(\mu_R, \lambda_R)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega_1)} \leq \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega_R)}$ that

$$\|v\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega_1)} \leq C_7 \left(\|F_R\|_{L^q(\Omega_1)} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^q(\Omega_1)} + \|(|\nabla \mu_R| + |\nabla \lambda_R|)|\nabla v\|_{L^q(\Omega_1)} \right),$$

where the positive constant $C_7 = C_7(q, \mu^0, \Omega_1, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega_R)})$ is independent of R . Converting this back into the unscaled variables, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega_R)} &\leq C_7 \left(R^{\frac{3}{p}-1} \|F\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + R^{-1} \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + R^{\frac{3}{p}-1} \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} \right) \\ &\leq C_7 \left(\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\Omega_R = B_R \cap \Omega$, where Ω is an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Choose a fixed number $R_1 \geq 1$ such that $\Omega^c \subset B_{R_1}$ and assume $R > 2R_1$. Assume that $u \in D_0^1(\Omega_R) \cap D^{1,q}(\Omega_R)$ be a weak solution to the system (5.1), where $1 < q < \infty$. If $F \in L^q(\Omega_R)$, $(\mu, \lambda) \in C^\beta(\Omega_R)$ with $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u| \in L^q(\Omega_R)$, then $u \in D^{2,q}(\Omega_R)$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega_R)} &\leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|u\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

where the positive constant $C = C(q, \mu^0, R_1, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega_R)})$ is independent of R .

Proof. Choosing a cut-off function $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\phi \equiv 1$ in B_{R_1} and $\phi \equiv 0$ in $B_{2R_1}^c$, we define

$$v = \phi u \text{ and } w = (1 - \phi)u := \psi u.$$

First, observing that $v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega_{2R_1})$, we deduce from Lemma 5.1 and Poincaré's inequality

$$\|u\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})},$$

(since $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$), that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|v\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega_{2R_1})} \\ &\leq C \left(\|P(\mu, \lambda, v)\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla v\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)(|\nabla u| + |u|)\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

Next, to estimate w , we observe that $w = 0$ in B_{R_1} and $w \in D_0^1 \cap D^{1,q}(B_R)$. Then it follows from Lemma 5.2 and Poincaré's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|w\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega_R)} \\ &\leq C \left(\|P(\mu, \lambda, w)\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|\nabla w\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla w\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega_R)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|)|u\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Combining (5.15) and (5.16), we finish the proof. □

Since the constant C in Lemma 5.2-5.3 is independent of R , using the domain expansion technique as in [15] and the fact that the solution to the system (5.1) is unique in $D_0^1(\Omega)$, we easily prove

Lemma 5.4. *Let Ω be the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$ or an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Assume that $u \in D_0^1(\Omega) \cap D^{1,q}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the system (5.1), where $1 < q < \infty$. If $F \in L^q(\Omega)$, $(\mu, \lambda) \in C^\beta(\Omega)$ with $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)|\nabla u| \in L^q(\Omega)$, then $u \in D^{2,q}(\Omega)$ satisfying*

$$\|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right), \quad (5.17)$$

when Ω is the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$ or the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$; and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{D^{2,q}(\Omega)} &\leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)|u\|_{L^q(\Omega_{2R_1})} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

when Ω is an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary, and $\Omega^c \subset B_{R_1}$ with $R_1 > 1$, where $C = C(q, \mu^0, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let Ω be the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$, an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ or a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Assume $F \in L^2(\Omega)$, $(\mu, \lambda) \in C^\beta \cap D^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $p > 3$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $u \in D_0^1(\Omega) \cap D^2(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the system (5.1), then we have*

$$\|u\|_{D^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)^{\frac{p}{p-3}} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right), \quad (5.19)$$

where $C = C(p, \mu^0, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$ is positive constant.

Proof. First, we consider the case that Ω is an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Using Hölder, Gagliardo-Nirenberg and Young's inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &C \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{p-3}{p}} \|u\|_{D^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{p}} \\ &\leq C \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)^{\frac{p}{p-3}} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{4} \|u\|_{D^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_{2R_1})} \\ &\leq C \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)\|_{L^p(\Omega_{2R_1})} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega_{2R_1})} \\ &\leq C \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)\|_{L^p(\Omega_{2R_1})} \|u\|_{L^6(\Omega_{2R_1})} \\ &\leq C \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

From Lemma 5.4 and the estimates (5.20)-(5.21), we have

$$\|u\|_{D^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|(|\nabla\mu| + |\nabla\lambda|)^{\frac{p}{p-3}} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right). \quad (5.22)$$

By similar arguments, we can easily obtain the result in the case that Ω is the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$ or a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. $\square$

Lemma 5.6. *Let Ω be the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$, an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ or a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Assume $F \in L^p(\Omega)$, $(\mu, \lambda) \in C^\beta \cap D^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $u \in D_0^1(\Omega) \cap D^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap D^{2,p}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the system (5.1), where $p > 3$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then we have*

$$\|u\|_{D^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{\frac{5p-6}{2p-6}} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right), \quad (5.23)$$

where $C = C(p, \mu^0, \|(\mu, \lambda)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$ is a positive constant.

Proof. First, we consider the case that Ω is an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Using Hölder, Gagliardo-Nirenberg and Young's inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & C \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|) |\nabla u|\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{2p-6}{5p-6}} \|u\|_{D^{2,p}(\Omega)}^{\frac{3p}{5p-6}} \\ & \leq C \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{\frac{5p-6}{2p-6}} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{4} \|u\|_{D^{2,p}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & C \|(|\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda|) |u|\|_{L^p(\Omega_{2R_1})} \\ & \leq C \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^p(\Omega_{2R_1})} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_{2R_1})} \\ & \leq C \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{4p-6}{5p-6}} \|u\|_{D^{2,p}(\Omega)}^{\frac{p}{5p-6}} \\ & \leq C \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{\frac{5p-6}{4p-6}} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{4} \|u\|_{D^{2,p}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

From Lemma 5.4 and the estimates (5.24)-(5.25), we have

$$\|u\|_{D^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \| |\nabla \mu| + |\nabla \lambda| \|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{\frac{5p-6}{2p-6}} \|u\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right). \quad (5.26)$$

By similar arguments, we can easily obtain the result in the case that Ω is the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$ or a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. $\square$

Using similar arguments in Lemmas 5.5-5.6, we can easily obtain:

Lemma 5.7. *Let Ω be the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$, an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ or a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Assume $G \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\kappa \in C^\beta \cap D^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $p > 3$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $e \in D_0^1(\Omega) \cap D^2(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the system (5.2), then we have*

$$\|e\|_{D^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|G\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla e\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{\frac{p}{p-3}} \|e\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right), \quad (5.27)$$

where $C = C(p, \kappa^0, \|\kappa\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$ is a positive constant.

Lemma 5.8. *Let Ω be the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$, the half space $\mathbb{R}_+^3$, an exterior domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary or a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Assume $G \in L^p(\Omega)$, $\kappa \in C^\beta \cap D^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $e \in D_0^1(\Omega) \cap D^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap D^{2,p}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution to the system (5.2) with $p > 3$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then we have*

$$\|e\|_{D^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|G\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla e\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \kappa\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^{\frac{5p-6}{2p-6}} \|e\|_{D_0^1(\Omega)} \right), \quad (5.28)$$

where $C = C(p, \kappa^0, \|\kappa\|_{C^\beta(\Omega)})$ is a positive constant.

Remark 5.1. We can remove the assumptions in Lemma 5.5-5.8 that $(u, e) \in D^2$ or $D^{2,q}$. Indeed, we can use the usual iteration argument to prove that $(u, e) \in D^2$ or $D^{2,q}$ rigorously.

6 Blow-up

In this section, we show the blow-up of the smooth solution to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 1$) when the initial density has compactly support and the initial total momentum is nonzero. We denote by $X(\alpha, t)$ the particle trajectory starting at α when $t = 0$, that is

$$\frac{d}{dt}X(\alpha, t) = u(X(\alpha, t), t) \text{ and } X(\alpha, 0) = \alpha.$$

We set $\Omega(0) = \text{supp}\rho_0$ and $\Omega(t) = \{x = X(\alpha, t) | \alpha \in \Omega(0)\}$. From the transport equation (1.24), one can easily show that $\text{supp}\rho(x, t) = \Omega(t)$ and hence from the equation of state (1.27) that

$$p(x, t) = \theta(x, t) = e(x, t) = 0, \text{ if } x \in \Omega(t)^c.$$

Therefore, from the equation (1.26), we observe that

$$\frac{\mu(0, 0)}{2} |\nabla u + \nabla u^\top|^2 + \lambda(0, 0) (\text{div} u)^2 = 0, \text{ if } x \in \Omega(t)^c.$$

The following lemma was shown in [4, 22], when μ, λ are constants. Therefore, the proof is very similar to that in [4, 22], and is just modified to our case that (μ, λ) satisfies (1.28), so we omit the detail.

Lemma 6.1. *We assume that (μ, λ) satisfies (1.28), and $(\rho, S, u) \in C^1([0, T]; H^k)$, $k > [\frac{n}{2}] + 2$, is a solution to the Cauchy problem (1.24)-(1.26). Then*

$$u(x, t) = 0 \text{ in } x \in \Omega(t)^c.$$

Moreover, $\Omega(t) = \Omega(0)$ for all $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3

We assume that $\Omega(t) = \text{supp}\rho(\cdot, t)$ is contained in a ball $B_{r(t)}$. Multiplying x_i to (1.24) and integrating it over $\mathbb{R}^n$, we get the identity

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho x_i dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho u_i dx. \quad (6.1)$$

If we integrate (1.25) over $\mathbb{R}^n$, then we also obtain the identity

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho u dx = 0. \quad (6.2)$$

Integrating (6.1) and (6.2) over $[0, t]$, respectively, we obtain the following identities

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho x_i dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0 x_i dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho u_i dx ds, \quad (6.3)$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho u dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0 u_0 dx. \quad (6.4)$$

From (6.3)-(6.4), we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho x_i dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0 x_i dx + t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0 u_{0i} dx = m_{1i} + m_{2i}t. \quad (6.5)$$

On the other hand, since $\Omega(t) \subset B_{r(t)}$, we can estimate the bound of the L.H.S. of (6.5) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho x_i dx \right| &= \left| \int_{\Omega(t)} \rho x_i dx \right| = \left| \int_{|x| \leq r(t)} \rho x_i dx \right| \\ &\leq r(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho dx = r(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_0 dx = r(t)m_0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

From Lemma 6.1, we have $\Omega(t) = \Omega(0)$ for $t \in [0, T]$ and hence $r(t)$ can be chosen to be r_0 . Therefore, we have

$$m_0 r_0 \geq m_{1i} + m_{2i}t \geq -m_0 r_0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem 1.3.

References

- [1] S. Agmon, A. Douglis, L. Nirenberg, Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions II. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 17 (1964) 35–92.
- [2] E. Becker, *Gasdynamik*, Teubner Verlag, Stuttgart, 1966.
- [3] Y. Cho, H. J. Choe, H. Kim, Unique solvability of the initial boundary value problems for compressible viscous fluids, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 83 (2004) 243–275.
- [4] Y. Cho, B. J. Jin, Blow-up of the viscous heat-conducting compressible flow, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 320 (2) (2006) 819–826.
- [5] Y. Cho, H. Kim, Existence results for viscous polytropic fluids with vacuum, Preprint 2004.
- [6] Y. Cho, H. Kim, Existence result for heat-conducting viscous incompressible fluids with vacuum, Preprint 2005.
- [7] H. J. Choe, H. Kim, Strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for isentropic compressible fluids, *J. Differential Equations* 190 (2003) 504–523.
- [8] H. J. Choe, H. Kim, Strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for nonhomogeneous incompressible fluids, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 28 (2003) 1183–1201.
- [9] R. Danchin, Global existence in critical spaces for compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Invent. Math.* 141 (2000) 579–614.
- [10] B. Desjardins, Regularity of weak solutions of the compressible isentropic Navier-Stokes equation, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 22 (1997) 977–1008.
- [11] R. J. DiPerna, P. L. Lions, Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces, *Invent. Math.* 98 (1989) 511–547.

- [12] E. Feireisl, *On the motion of a viscous, compressible, and heat conducting fluid*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 53 (6) (2004) 1705–1738.
- [13] S. Jiang, Global smooth solutions of the equations of a viscous, heat-conducting, one-dimensional gas with density-dependent viscosity. Math. Nachr. 190 (1998) 169–183.
- [14] M. Kawashita, On global solutions of Cauchy problems for compressible Navier-Stokes equations, Nonlinear Anal. 48 (2002) 1087–1105.
- [15] P.-L. Lions, *Mathematical Topics in Fluid Mechanics. Vol. 1,2*. Oxford University Press: New York, 1996, 1998.
- [16] T. Makino, S. Ukai, S. Kawashima, Sur la solution à support compact de l'équation d'Euler compressible, Japan J. Appl. Math. 3 (2) (1986) 249–257.
- [17] A. Matsumura, T. Nishida, Initial-boundary value problems for the equations of motion of compressible viscous and heat-conductive fluids, Comm. Math. Phys. 89 (4) (1983) 445–464.
- [18] R. Salvi, I. Straškraba, Global existence for viscous compressible fluids and their behavior as $t \rightarrow \infty$, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA, Math. 40 (1) (1993) 17–51.
- [19] T. C. Sideris, Formation of singularities in three-dimensional compressible fluids, Comm. Math. Phys. 101 (4) (1985) 475–487.
- [20] V. A. Solonnikov, On the solvability of boundary and initial-boundary value problems for the Navier-Stokes system in domains with noncompact boundaries, Pacific J. Math. 93 (2) (1981) 443–458.
- [21] I. Straškraba, A. A. Zlotnik, Global properties of solutions to 1D-viscous compressible barotropic fluid equations with density dependent viscosity, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. 54 (4) (2003) 593–607.
- [22] Z. P. Xin, Blow-up of smooth solution to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with compact density, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 51 (3) (1998) 229–240.
- [23] T. Yang, C.J. Zhu, Compressible Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate viscosity coefficient and vacuum, Comm. Math. Phys. 230 (2) (2002) 329–363.
- [24] Y. B. Zel'dovich, Y. P. Raizer, *Physics of shock waves and high-temperature hydrodynamic phenomena, vol II*, Academic Press, New York, 1967.
- [25] T. Zhang, D. Y. Fang, Global behavior of compressible Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate viscosity coefficient, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 182 (2) (2006) 223–253.